A

COMMENTARY

ON THE

HOLY SCRIPTURES:

CRITICAL, DOCTRINAL AND HOMILETICAL,

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MINISTERS AND STUDENTS.

BY

JOHN PETER LANGE, D. D.,

IN CONNECTION WITH A NUMBER OF EMINENT EUROPEAN DIVINES.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, AND EDITED, WITH ADDITIONS, ORIGINAL AND SELECTED,

BY

PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D.,

IN CONNECTION WITH AMERICAN SCHOLARS OF VARIOUS EVANGELICAL DENOMINATIONS.

VOL. V. OF THE OLD TESTAMENT:

CONTAINING THE FIRST AND SECOND BOOKS OF SAMUEL.

NEW YORK:

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,

SUCCESSORS TO

SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO.

THE BOOKS

OF

SAMUEL.

BY

REV. DR. CHR. FR. DAVID ERDMANN,

GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT OF THE PROVINCE OF SILESIA, AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BRESLAU.

TRANSLATED, ENLARGED AND EDITED

BY

REV. C. H. TOY, D. D., LL. D.,

AND

REV. JOHN A. BROADUS, D. D., LL. D.,

PROFESSORS IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT LOUISVILLE, KY.

NEW YORK:

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,

SUCCESSORS TO

SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO.

GRANT, FAIRES & RODGERS,
ELECTROTYPERS AND PRINTERS,
PHILADELPHIA.

PREFACE TO VOL. V. OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE Commentary on the two Books of Samuel was prepared in German by the Rev. Dr. ERDMANN, General Superintendent of Silesia and Honor. Professor of Theology in the University of Breslau, and in English by the Rev. C. H. TOY, D.D., LL.D., and the Rev. JOHN A. BROADUS, D.D., LL.D., Professors in the Theological Seminary at Greenville, South Carolina.

Dr. ERDMANN, in his Preface, dated Breslau, March 8, 1873, says:

'In regard to the execution of the work in its several parts, I add the following remarks. In the translation, while I have tried to follow the ground-text closely, I have preserved as far as possible the tone and impress of Luther's translation. On account of the admitted defectiveness of the Masoretic text of these books, it seemed to me better not to place the textual remarks and discussions, together with the various readings and emendations, under the text of the translation, but to insert them in the exegetical explanations. In the exegesis I have departed in one point from the form usual in this Bible-Work, namely, instead of explanations under each verse, I have given an exegesis that reproduces the content of the text in connected development, following the received division of verses. "Exegesis," therefore, or "Scientific Exposition," would have been a fitter heading for the section in question than "Exegetical Explanations." * In the next division, instead of the usual heading, "Dogmatic and Ethical Fundamental Thoughts," I have chosen as a more appropriate designation for these prophetical-historical books: "Theocratic-historical and Biblical-Theological Comments;" † for we have here to do with a new step in the historical development of the Theocracy in Israel, and with the wider unfolding of the religious-ethical truth which has its root in the advancing revelation of God. From this point of view of the history of revelation and the theocracy, the comments and remarks of this section are intended to serve as contributions to the hitherto too little cultivated science of the Biblical Theology of the Old Testament. In the homiletical section, while I have given my own words, I have rather cited the diverse witnesses of ancient and modern times, from whom I could derive any valuable material for fruitful application and parænetic use of the text on the basis of the preceding scientific exposition.

'In every part of my work on this portion of the Old Testament history of the Kingdom of God, with its fund of religious-ethical revelation, I have been constantly reminded of and deeply impressed by a profound saying of HAMANN, with which I here close: "Every biblical history is a prophecy, which is fulfilled through all the centuries and in the soul of every human being. Every history bears the image of man, a *body*, which is earth and ashes and nothing, the sensible letter; but also a *soul*, the breath of God, the life and the light, which shines in the dark, and cannot be comprehended by the darkness. The Spirit of God in His word reveals itself as the Self-sufficient in the form of a servant, in *flesh*, and dwells among us full of grace and truth."'

As regards the English edition, the work has been so divided that Dr. TOY prepared the Exegetical and Historical sections, and paid careful and minute attention to the Hebrew text; Dr. BROADUS has reproduced the Homiletical and Practical portions, partly condensing and partly enlarging the original from English sources, especially from Bishop HALL's Contemplations and Sermons, MATTHEW HENRY's Commentary, and Dr. W. TAYLOR's Life of David.

PHILIP SCHAFF.

NEW YORK, 42 BIBLE HOUSE, March 1, 1877.

---

* ['Exegetical and Critical' is the heading adopted for the section in this translation.]
† ['Historical and Theological' in the translation.]

THE

BOOKS OF SAMUEL.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. THE NAME.

THE title of these books is an indication not of their origin, but of their chief contents. Although it is only in the first book that the work of the Judge and Prophet Samuel is expressly related, and himself, with the divine mission which he had to fulfil for Saul and David, everywhere made to take precedence of them, yet the naming of *both* books after Samuel is justified by the fact that Samuel, by his conspicuous position, as it is set forth only in the first book in his judicial and prophetic office in the light of special divine call and guidance (he being not merely the close of the troubled period of the Judges, but also the foundational beginning of the divinely ordained kingly rule in Israel), thus towers far above the first two kings, so far as they were chosen and called through him, and points out and maintains for the Israelitish kingdom, which owes its origination and stability to him, its true theocratic basis and significance. ABARBANEL remarks rightly (*Præf. in Libr. Sam.* f. 74, in CARPZOV, *Introd.* p. 212): "All the contents of both books may in a certain sense be referred to Samuel, even the deeds of Saul and David, because both, having been anointed by Samuel, were, so to speak, the work of his hands." KEIL also well says: "The naming of both these books, which in form and content are an inseparable whole, after Samuel is explained by the fact that Samuel not only by the anointing of Saul and David inaugurates the kingdom in Israel, but at the same time by his prophetic activity exerts so determining an influence on the spirit of Saul's government as well as David's, that this government also may be regarded as in a sort the continuation and completion of the reformation of the Israelitish theocracy begun by the prophet." (Introduction to Prophetical Historical Books of O. T. [CLARK'S *Foreign Theol. Library*], prefixed to Vol. IV. (Josh., Judg., Ruth), p. 4).

§ 2. DIVISION.

In the Hebrew manuscripts and in the Jewish list of Old Testament books only *one* book of Samuel, שְׁמוּאֵל, is given. Its division into two books under this name, as we find it in our printed texts of the Old Testament, was first introduced in the sixteenth century, by DANIEL BOMBERG, after the example of the Septuagint and the Vulgate, and may be regarded as thus far appropriate, that the death of Saul, that epoch-making occurrence in the early history of the Israelitish kingdom, forms the close of the first book. Our Hebrew editions of the Bible follow the Seventy in dividing the Hebrew book of Samuel into two parts; they (the LXX.) did not, however, name these two books after Samuel, but included them with the two books of Kings, into which they in like manner divided the original *one* Hebrew book of Kings, מְלָכִים, under the common name "Books of the Kingdoms," *βίβλοι βασιλειῶν*. After the example of the Septuagint we find in the Greek Church-fathers and also

in the *Vulgate* and the Latin Church-fathers, this division of the books of Samuel and Kings as *one* historical work into *four* books cited as the four βίβλοι βασιλειῶν, *libri regum* or *regnorum*. This way of combining, dividing, and naming, in which our "Books of Samuel" are numbered as βασιλειῶν πρώτη, δευτέρα "First, Second Kings" (comp. ORIGEN in EUSEB. *H. E.* VI. 25, and Jerome, *Prol. Gal.*) corresponds certainly to the general contents of these four, or more precisely two, books, so far as it consists chiefly of the history of the kingdom in the Old Testament covenant-people, and appears as a connected whole in the continuous narrative from Samuel's birth to the time of the Babylonian Exile.

§ 3. CONTENT.

The content of the books of Samuel is in *general* the historical development of the Theocracy in the people of Israel from the end of the period of the Judges to near the end of the government of King David, and therefore embraces a space of nearly one hundred and twenty-five years, about 1140—1015 B. C. (KEIL, *Comm. on Sam.*, Introd. p. 2). The beginning of the *first* book introduces us into the end of the period of the Judges under the High-priest Eli, narrating the history of the announcement, birth, childhood, and calling of Samuel (chs. i.—iii.), and the troubled history of the people in the latter part of the misgovernment of Eli amid constant unfortunate conflicts with the Philistines (ch. iv. sq.). Then follows the history of Israel under Samuel as the last Judge and Saul as the first king up to the death of Samuel (ch. xxv.), and Saul (ch. xxxi.)——In the *second* book—whose original connection with the first is indicated not only formally by the fact that the masoretic appended remarks are placed only at the end of the second book, but also by the close connection between the historical contents of the two—the history of the government of David almost to its end, up to the punishment inflicted by God for the numbering of the people, forms the chief content, though its proper conclusion is found in the beginning of the first book of Kings, where David's last sickness and death, and Solomon's accession, are related. As on the one side the content of the books of Samuel goes over into the beginning of the books of Kings, so in the other direction it connects itself immediately with the history of the people of Israel in the book of Judges. The Old Testament history in its two factors—on the one hand the revelation of the living God to His chosen people, and on the other hand the thereby conditioned demeanor of the people towards its God in its general religious-ethical life—can be regarded only from the theocratic point of view, as the history of the kingdom of God in the people of Israel, and this history shows us in the course, and especially at the end of the period of the Judges, a deep decline of the Theocracy. The revelations of God's saving power in the time of the Judges, always sporadic, became less and less frequent towards its end. The people were a long time in bondage under the dominion of the Philistines, and Samson's twenty-years-judgeship could be described (Judg. xiii. 5) only as the *beginning* of the deliverance of Israel out of their hand. The internal political life was completely disintegrated, the sanctuary-service had perished, the priesthood was corrupted, idolatry widespread, godlessness and immorality had the upper hand. This deep decline is pictured in the beginning of the first book of Samuel, in immediate connection with the description given in the book of Judges, in the condition of the religious ethical life under the high-priesthood of Eli, and in the desecration of the priesthood wrought by the godlessness and wicked deeds of his two sons; and from it the theocracy was extricated by Samuel's labors as Shophet (Judge) and Prophet, and under the guidance of God was led by this great Reformer into a new path of development. Without, under Samuel and the royal rule introduced by him, political freedom and independence of heathen powers (of the Philistines in the first place) was gradually achieved, and within, the internal theocratic covenant-relation between the people of Israel and their God was renewed and extended on the basis of the restored unity and order of political and national life by the union of the prophetic and royal offices. Looked at from this theocratic point of view, the books of Samuel have an epoch-making content.

From the three principal persons to whom this foundational historical development of the theocracy on its new course attaches itself, the contents of the books of Samuel divide

themselves into three *principal groups:* 1) 1 Sam. chs. i.—vii.: *The history of Samuel* as restorer of the deep-sunken theocracy, and founder of the Israelitish kingdom. 2) Chs. viii.—xxxi.: *The history of Saul and his kingdom* from the beginning of his government to his death. 3) 2 Sam. chs. i.—xxiv.: *The history of the government of David.*

According to these three principal points of view, the contents divide themselves as follows:

FIRST PART.

SAMUEL.—1 Sam. Chs. i.—vii.

Samuel's Life and Work as Judge and Prophet,

his aim being a reformation of the theocracy and the founding of the theocratical kingdom.

FIRST DIVISION.

Early life of Samuel, 1 Sam. chs. i.—iii.

Sec. I. Samuel's birth, in answer to prayer, ch. i. 1–20.
Sec. II. Samuel's dedication,—restoration to the Lord, ch. i. 21–28.
Sec. III. His mother's prayer over him, ch. ii. 1–10.
Sec. IV. Samuel's service before the Lord contrasted with the abominations of the degenerate priesthood in the house of Eli, ch. ii. 11–26.
Sec. V. The prophecy of God's punishment of Eli's house, and of the calling of a faithful priest, ch. ii. 27–36.
Sec. VI. Samuel's call to be prophet alongside of the lack of prophecy in Israel, ch. iii. 1–18.
Sec. VII. The beginning of his prophetical work, ch. iii. 19—iv. 1.

SECOND DIVISION.

Samuel's prophetic-judicial work, 1 Sam. chs. iv. 1—vii. 17.

First Section.—Infliction of the punishment prophesied by Samuel on the house of Eli and on all Israel in the unfortunate battle with the Philistines, ch. iv. 1—vii. 1.

I. Israel's double defeat and loss of the Ark, ch. iv. 1–11.
II. The judgment on the house of Eli, ch. iv. 12–22.
III. The Ark in the hands of the Philistines as a judgment on Israel (comp. ch. iv. 22), chs. v. 1—vii. 1.
1) Chastisement of the Philistines because they held the Ark, ch. v. 1–12.
2) Restoration of the Ark, ch. vi. 1–11.
3) Reception and Settling of the Ark in Israel, chs. vi. 12—vii. 1.

Second Section.—Samuel's Reformation of Israel, ch. vii. 2–17.

I. Israel's repentance and conversion through Samuel's *prophetic* labors, vers. 2–6.
II. Israel's victory over the Philistines under Samuel's lead, vers. 7–14.
III. Summary view of Samuel's *work as Judge,* vers. 15–17.

(Close of the period of the Judges).

SECOND PART.

SAUL.—1 Sam. Chs. viii.—xxxi.

FIRST DIVISION.

Founding of the Israelitish kingdom under Saul's rule, 1 Sam. chs. viii.—xii.

First Section.—The preparations, chs. viii., ix.

I. The occasion in the desire of the people for a king. Interview of the Elders with Samuel, ch. viii.
II. Samuel meets with Saul, and learns of his divine appointment to be king, ch. ix.

Second Section.—Saul's *induction* into the royal office, ch. x.

I. Saul anointed by Samuel, ch. x. 1.
II. The signs of divine confirmation, ch. x. 2–16.
III. The choice by lot, ch. x. 17–21.
IV. The installation and homage (but not of the whole people), ch. x. 22–27.

Third Section.—Establishment and general recognition of the kingdom under Saul, chs. xi., xii.

I. Saul's first victory over the Ammonites, ch. xi.
II. Samuel's last address, ch. xii.

SECOND DIVISION.

King Saul's government up to his rejection, 1 Sam. chs. xiii.—xv.

First Section.—The unfolding of his royal power in victorious battles for the salvation of Israel, chs. xiii., xiv.

I. Against the Philistines, chs. xiii.—xiv. 46.
II. Against the other enemies around about, especially Amalek, ch. xiv. 47–52.

Second Section.—The rejection of Saul for his disobedience in the war against Amalek, ch. xv.

THIRD DIVISION.

The decline of Saul's kingdom, and choice of David to be king. The history of Saul from his rejection to his death, 1 Sam. chs. xvi.—xxxi.

First Section.—Early history of David, the Anointed of the Lord, ch. xvi.

I. David chosen and anointed as king by Samuel, ch. xvi. 1–13.
II. Darkening of Saul's soul by an evil spirit, and David's first appearance at the court of Saul as harper, ch. xvi. 14–23.

Second Section.—Saul's new war with the Philistines, and *David's deed of deliverance,* with its diverse consequences for him and for his relation to Saul, chs. xvii.—xviii. 30.

I. The Philistine host, and Goliath's haughty challenge, ch. xvii. 1–11.
II. David and Goliath, ch. xvii. 12–54.
III. David at Saul's court, his friendship with Jonathan; Saul's hostile disposition towards him, and murderous attacks on his life, ch. xvii. 55—xviii. 30.

Third Section.—David fleeing before Saul, and his persecution by Saul, chs. xix. 1—xxvii. 12.

I. David's flight from Saul's attacks to Samuel to Rama and Naioth, ch. xix.
II. Jonathan's faithful friendship, attested by repeated unsuccessful attempts to reconcile Saul with David, ch. xx.
III. David's flight from Saul to the priest Ahimelech in Nob, and to the Philistine king Achish in Gath, ch. xxi.
IV. David's wandering as fugitive in Judah and Moab, and the murder of priests in Nob perpetrated by Saul, ch. xxii.
V. David's experience of God's help and preservation in the battle against the Philistines, in his betrayal by the Ziphites, and when he was waylaid by Saul in the wilderness of Maon, ch. xxiii.
VI. David encounters Saul while the latter is laying snares for him, and nobly spares his life in a cave of the mountains of Engedi, ch. xxiv.
VII. Samuel's death, and David's march into the wilderness of Paran, with the history of Nabal and Abigail, ch. xxv.
VIII. Narration of a second betrayal by the Ziphites, and second magnanimous sparing of Saul by David, ch. xxvi.
IX. David takes refuge from Saul at Ziklag in Philistia, ch. xxvii.

Fourth Section.—Saul perishes in the war against the Philistines, chs. xxviii.—xxxi.

I. Saul's fear of the war with the Philistines, and his recourse to the witch, ch. xxviii. (Confirmation of his rejection, and announcement of his approaching end).
II. David's march from the theatre of the Philistine war against Israel back to Philistia, ch. xxix.
III. David's victory over the Amalekites, who had plundered and burned Ziklag, ch. xxx.
IV. Death of Saul and his sons in the battle with the Philistines, ch. xxxi.

THIRD PART.

David.—Second Book of Samuel.

FIRST DIVISION.

David king over Judah only, up to his acquisition of the general rule over all Israel, 2 Sam. chs. i.—v. 5.

First Section.—David after the death of Saul, (ch. i. 1)—ch. i.

I. The tidings of death, ch. i. 1–16.
II. The lament, ch. i. 17–27.

Second Section.—David, king of the tribe of Judah, is opposed by the house of Saul, chs. ii.—iii. 39.

I. David anointed king over Judah, and his abode at Hebron, ch. ii. 1–7.
II. Ishbosheth, contrary to the divine arrangement, made king over all Israel by Abner, and continued struggle of the House of Saul and the adherents of Ishbosheth under Abner's lead against David and his house, and his adherents, chs. ii. 8—iii. 6.
III. Abner breaks with Ishbosheth, leaves the house of Saul, and goes over to David, ch. iii. 7–21.
IV. Murder of Abner by Joab, David's General, ch. iii. 22–39.

Third Section.—David gains sole authority over all Israel, chs. iv.—v. 5.

I. Murder of Ishbosheth, ch. iv. 1–8.
II. Punishment of the regicide by David, ch. iv. 9–12.
III. David anointed king over all Israel, ch. v. 1–5.

SECOND DIVISION.

David's royal rule over all Israel, 2 Sam. chs. v. 5—xxiv. 5.

First Section.—David's rule in its greatest splendor, chs. v. 5—x. 19.

I. Its glorious and firm *establishment*, chs. v. 5—vi. 23.
   1) The victory over the Jebusites—the citadel of Zion made the centre of the kingdom, ch. v. 6–16.
   2) The victory over the Philistines, ch. v. 17–25.
   3) Solemn transference of the Ark to Mount Zion, and establishment of a regular religious service, ch. vi.
II. *Its divine consecration* by the *promise* of the perpetual kingly rule of the Davidic House, ch. vii.
   1) To David's purpose, to build a house for the Lord, answers the divine promise, of which he becomes partaker by Nathan's prophecy, that the Lord would build *him* a house, and *after* him (and not till then) his seed should build *the Lord* a house, ch. vii. 1–16.

2) *David's answer* to this divine declaration in a *prayer*, ch. vii. 17–29.

III. *The splendid development* of David's rule without and within, chs. viii.–x.

1) *Without* by victories and conquests in battle against Israel's foreign foes, ch. viii. 1–14.
2) *Within* by the organization of the government of the kingdom (ch. viii. 15–18), and a noble display of royal grace towards Saul's fallen House—Mephibosheth, ch. ix.

IV. Further victorious confirmation and elevation of the royal power to its zenith in the Ammonite-Syrian war, ch. x.

1) The insult offered David by the king of the Ammonites, ch. x. 1–5.
2) Joab's victory over the combined Ammonites and Syrians, ch. x. 6–14.
3) David's victory over the Syrians, ch. x. 14–19.

Second Section. Its obscuration, chs. xi.–xviii.

I. *Internal shock* to David's royal authority by the *grievous sins* of himself and his House, chs. xi.–xiv.

1) David's *deep fall* during the war against Rabbath-Ammon, ch. xi.
2) Nathan's *reproof* and David's *repentance*, ch. xii.
3) Shattering of the House and family of David by the wickedness of his sons Amnon and Absalom, ch. xiii.
   a. Amnon's incest with Tamar, ch. xiii. 1–21.
   b. Murder of Amnon by Absalom, ch. xiii. 22–33.
   c. Absalom's flight, xiii. 34–39.
4) David's weakness towards Joab and Absalom, xiv.
   a. Joab's cunning, and the woman of Tekoa, xiv. 1–20.
   b. Absalom's return to Jerusalem brought about by Joab's influence with David, xiv. 21–28.
   c. Absalom forces Joab by an injury to effect his reconciliation with David, xiv. 29–33.

II. *External disintegration* of the royal authority up to *its loss*, xv.–xviii.

1) Absalom stirs up the people, and usurps the royal power, xv. 1–13.
2) David's flight from Absalom, xv. 14–37.
3) David's two encounters with disloyal persons, xvi. 1–14.
   a. With the lying Ziba, xvi. 1–4.
   b. With the reviling Shimei, xvi. 5-14.
4) Absalom's entry into Jerusalem and incestuous act after Ahithophel's counsel, xvi. 15–23.
5) Ahithophel's evil counsel against David set aside by Hushai's good counsel—his horrible end, xvii. 1–23.
6) The civil war, xvii. 24—xviii. 33.
   a. David at Mahanaim, xvii. 24–29.
   b. The battle in the wilderness of Ephraim, xviii. 1–8.
   c. Murder of Absalom by Joab, xviii. 9–18.
   d. Tidings of joy and of sorrow—David's lament over Absalom, xviii. 19–33.

Third Section. The recovery of the royal authority, which is soon, however, again assailed by insurrection, xix., xx.

I. The way paved for the restoration of David's authority by Joab's reproval of his unworthy grief over Absalom, xix. 1–8.

II. David arranges for his return by negotiations with the men of Judah, xix. 9–14.

III. David's passage over the Jordan under the escort of the men of Judah, with three incidents, xix. 15–40.

1) Pardon of Shimei, vers. 16–23.
2) Mephibosheth's excuse, vers. 24–30.
3) Barzillai's greeting and blessing, vers. 31–40.

IV. Strife between Judah and Israel about bringing David back (xix. 41–44), and occasioned by this,

V. Sheba's insurrection and Israel's defection—both subdued by Joab after Amasa was killed, xx. 1–22.

VI. Officers of David's government after the restoration of his royal authority, xx. 23–26.

THIRD DIVISION.

Eclectic appendix to the *conclusion* of the history of David's government, chs. xxi.–xxiv.

Sec. I. *Three years' famine* on account of Saul's crime against the Gibeonites, and expiation of this crime, xxi. 1–14.

Sec. II. Victorious battles *against the Philistines*, xxi. 15–22.

Sec. III. David's *song of thanksgiving*, xxii.

Sec. IV. David's *last prophetic* word, xxiii. 1–7.

Sec. V. David's *heroes*, xxiii. 8–39.

Sec. VI. The divine *visitation by pestilence* on account of the numbering of the people, xxiv.

I. David's sin in the numbering of the people, xxiv. 1–10.

II. The pestilence as *punishment* on the king and *all the people*, xxiv. 11–17.

III. David builds an *altar* to the Lord on the *threshing-floor of Araunah*, afterwards the *site of the Temple*, xxiv. 18–25.

[The following references to the Books of Samuel occur in the New Testament:

Matt. i. 6	to 1 Sam. xvi. and 2 Sam. xii. 24.
Matt. xii. 3, 4; Mark ii. 25, 26; Luke vi. 3, 4	to 1 Sam. xxi. 1–6.
Luke i. 32, 33; Acts ii. 30	to 2 Sam. vii. 12–16.
Acts iii. 24	to the general history.
Acts vii. 46	to 2 Sam. vii. 1, 2.
Acts xiii. 20–22	to 1 Sam. ix.–xv.
Heb. i. 5	to 2 Sam. vii. 14.

Mary's song, Luke i. 46–55, founded on Hannah's song, 1 Sam. ii. 1–10.

These are sufficient to show that the writers of the New Testament and our Lord recognized the canonical authority of these Books, which, however, has never been questioned. —Tr.]

§ 4. CHARACTER AND COMPOSITION.

In investigating the origin of the Books of Samuel, it will be necessary, first, to fix on their characteristic quality of *form* and *content* in its fundamental features, because it is only in this way that we can get firm ground for considering the sources, the time of composition, and the author of the books. As to their *linguistic* character, in the first place, it is agreed by all competent critics that the language is throughout the pure classic, and in general free from Aramaizing elements, the mark of a later, not classically pure style. While in the Books of Kings there is often an inclination to the Aramaic, in the books of Samuel there is as good as none of it (Bleek, *Einl. i. A. T.* [Introd. to O. T.], 1860, p. 358), "except those isolated cases which occur in all the books" (Naegelsbach, *Bücher Samuelis*, in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, Bd. XIII., p. 412, and Keil, *Einl. in das A. T.*, 2 *Aufl.* p. 176 f [*Introd.* I. 247]). On the linguistic peculiarities of the Books of Samuel, compare what is said on the subject in Ewald's *Hist. of the People of Israel*, 3d ed., I. 193 seq., and on the alleged Aramaisms, Haevernick, *Einl. in das A. T.* [Introd. to O. T.], I. i. p. 213 seq.

In the *composition* and *style* of the historical content of the books, the first thing that strikes us is that *bits of poetry* occur in them more frequently than in any other historical

book. At the very beginning stands Hannah's lofty song of praise, which exhibits not only the history of Samuel's birth, with which it is connected, but the whole history of his life and work in the clear light of divine ordination and guidance (1 Sam. ii. 1–10). The words taken from the people's chant of victory about David (1 Sam. xvii. 6 sq.) show us why Saul's heart is embittered against David into envy and jealousy. David's lamentation over Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i. 17-27) exhibits the noble feeling which David constantly maintained for Saul under all the experiences of his hatred and enmity, but at the same time indicates the judgment to be passed on Saul from a theocratic point of view, in so far as bravery is its only subject, and it celebrates him as hero only. Reference is there made to an authority called "The Book of the Upright." Other poetical pieces are David's Lamentation over Abner (2 Sam. iii. 33, 34), his Psalm of Thanksgiving (2 Sam. xxii.), his Prayer after the reception of the great promise concerning the rule of his House (2 Sam. vii. 18-29), and his last Psalm (2 Sam. xxiii. 1–7).

According to HAEVERNICK, these songs form, as they are interwoven into the historical work, the points of support, as it were, to which the history is attached (*Einl.* [Introd.] II. 1, p. 121). But a mere glance at the quantitative relation of these poetical elements of the content to the historical material shows us how unsatisfactory this view is. If we bear in mind the position that these songs occupy in reference to the history to which they relate, rather the reverse seems to be true—it forms the point of support for them. The songs are introduced into the place in the history where they, being themselves historical elements, fit, without being intended precisely to serve as vouchers for the history, as HÆVERNICK supposes (*ubi supra*). Standing as lyrical accompaniment in organic connection with the historical narration, they affect the coloring of the whole by heightening the liveliness, freshness and vividness of the historical narrative.

And this is throughout the character of the *narration*, effort at completeness in the accounts of deeds and persons which are often finished out to the smallest minutiæ, an elaborateness and vividness in the presentation of the historical material, not found in other historical books (especially in the Books of Kings which only here and there make brief extracts from their extensive authorities), and such freshness and directness in the coloring of the narrative that we cannot resist the impression that we have here an immediate copy of the incidents related, and that the editor did not draw from any intermediate working up of the original authorities. The narrative has an easy, simple, attractive flow, without interruption by stereotyped phrases and references to authorities, while in the Books of Kings there is a tedious, ever-recurring apparatus of standing formulæ. THENIUS says (*Einl. zum Komment über die Bücher Sam.* S. 16, 2 *Aufl.*): "For the rest, the older parts especially of the work belong to the finest historical productions of the Old Testament; they excel all others in copiousness; they enable us to form a distinct idea of the actors introduced; they commend themselves by a charming simplicity of style, and give us a high conception of the many-sided influence of the prophetic work."

HAEVERNICK rightly says, that from this characteristic of the book, it is itself almost the same as an original authority and chronicle (*Introd.* II. 1, p. 142). It therefore bears throughout the stamp of *historical truth*. By the simple and exact setting forth of the personages and their doings, by the characteristic sketches of their dispositions and characters, by the thorough description of historical antecedents and vivid and lively references to local relations and accidental circumstances, we are pointed to rich original authorities, that in an original and immediate way brought persons and events before the editor of the books, who was certainly too far removed from them in time to be able to give so living and detailed a portraiture from his own personal observation and experience. KEIL's remark, therefore—that, on account of the qualities above described, the historical narrative of the Books of Samuel may lay rightful claim to historical truth and fidelity not only in general, but also in special and particular—is quite correct, at least in respect to the first point [the general correctness]. We make this restriction here only in reference to those particulars of the narrative whose historical trustworthiness has been denied on the ground of incongruences, inconcinnities and contradictions supposed to be observed in them. To solve the questions

thus arising we must look more closely at the *literary* character and the *composition* of the books, for these are inseparable from the question of their historical value.

In the first place, it is certain that our Books of Samuel in form and content have the marks of a production that sprang from a *redaction of a manifold historical material*, which stretched over a space of more than a hundred years, and existed in various parts and groups, having already somehow taken shape by written tradition, and that this redaction is to be referred to the literary hand, traces of which we see in the passages, 1 Sam. ix. 9; xxvii. 6 and xvii. 12, 14, 15. Further, a glance at the content shows that the redactor of these books took pains to give them *unity*, to produce as well-arranged a historical narrative as possible. The narrative sets out with a sharply marked beginning in the latter part of the period of the Judges, shows in the relation of the history of Samuel, Saul and David everywhere a generally steady connection and advance, and also is not without a firm and strong conclusion, as we maintain, and shall endeavor to prove below, against the view that on account of the non-mention of the death of David, it has no proper conclusion. The author of our books has so combined and worked up the historical material that he had at command as to give them an internal unity of composition, and it is, as BLEEK rightly says (*ubi supra*, p. 367), decidedly incorrect to restrict the author's work (as has been done in part) to a mere stringing together and combination of earlier writings, that is, to regard it as an external compilation. Against this view comp. also DE WETTE, *Einl.* [Introd.] § 178. We shall see hereafter what points of view control the arrangement of the historical material, and condition the internal connection of its often seemingly loosely arranged parts. At present we only establish the fact, which is plain to an unprejudiced consideration of the external composition of the historical content, that the latter makes in the main the impression of a well-arranged unitary whole (see also NÆGELSBACH, *ubi sup.*, p. 400), and from this generally incontestable ground we shall proceed to consider a number of special passages which have been adduced against and seem to oppose the unity and concinnity of the historical narration in respect to its form and content.

In this examination we shall find that a not inconsiderable number of contradictions and incongruences supposed to be found in our books and referred to the union of various traditions and authorities, do not exist, or at least that there is no necessity for accepting them so long as unforced, satisfactory explanations of seeming discrepancies or repetitions may be given. At the same time unprejudiced regard for truth requires us to recognize the fact that there are certainly some passages in which there is not strict congruence and concinnity, and that there are certain peculiarities of the narration, in consequence of which there is in minutiæ an entire failure to maintain the historical connection according to the chronological order. Nevertheless, the general unity of the narrative, grounded in controlling fundamental thoughts, and in the sequence of events, is not only not impaired by these individual instances, but becomes clearer the more plainly we see from what chief point of view the redactor arranges and groups the material. The *contradictions* which it has been attempted to discover in the Books of Samuel as signs of various mutually exclusive parts out of which they have been put together, are all collected and examined, or rather solved, by a thorough explanation of the passages, in DE WETTE, *Einleit.* [Introd.], § 179; BLEEK, *Einleit.* [Introd.] p. 363; THENIUS, *ubi sup.*, *Einl.*, pp. 9–11; KEIL, *Einl.* [Introd.], § 52; HAEVERNICK, *Einl.* § 166; NAEGELSBACH, HERZOG, *R.-E.*, *ubi sup.*, p. 403.

In the first book the statement in ch. vii. 15–17 that Samuel was Judge over Israel *as long as he lived*, is said to conflict with viii. 1 sq. and xii. 2 sq., according to which he gave up his office to his sons. But when it is said in viii. 1 that Samuel made his sons judges over Israel, this is not saying that he himself gave up his office; rather this step of his is expressly referred to the fact that he was growing old. The application of the Elders of the people to him for a king (viii. 4), and their reference to the evil conduct of his sons, shows that, while the latter held the judicial office, he was the highest judicial authority in the administration of the affairs of the whole nation. The passage xii. 2 sq. shows plainly that Samuel, *while* his sons were judges, filled his old office "unto this day." His authority did not cease even under Saul; rather, knowing that he exercised his function in the name of the Lord, he

asserted it with all the more emphasis against Saul, and Saul yielded to it without making against him the charge of unauthorized conduct.

There is no contradiction between viii. 5 and xii. 12, when in the first passage Samuel's age and the evil conduct of his sons, and in the second the imminent danger of a crushing war with the Ammonites, is given as the occasion of the demand for a kingdom; for these two are inseparably connected. The people needed energetic and single guidance in its wars, and this it looked for not in the aging Samuel and his wicked sons, but in a man clothed with royal authority, under whose lead it might victoriously meet the kings of the heathen nations (comp. viii. 20). Besides, we must remember that Saul, though he was consecrated king over Israel by Samuel's anointing, yet at first returned to his original calling (xi. 5), and it was the attack of Nahash, the Ammonite king, that first aroused the people anew to a lively sense of their need of a royal leader, as is stated in xii. 12. And with this agrees the fact that, after the victory gained by Saul over the Ammonites by the power of the Spirit of God (xi. 6), the whole people recognized him as their now freshly authenticated king, and in consequence of this victory regarded as a divine declaration of the kingdom, the latter was renewed by the three parties to it, the people, Saul, and Samuel (xi. 12–15).

In chap. vii. 13 we read: "So the Philistines were subdued, and they came no more into the coast of Israel, and the hand of the Lord was against the Philistines *all the days of Samuel.*" A discrepancy has been discovered between these words, according to which Samuel completely estopped the Philistines from returning, and ix. 16, where a king is promised the people as deliverer out of the hand of the Philistines, and x. 5 and xiii. 5 sq., especially vers. 19 sq. and xvii. 1 sq., where there are express accounts of wars of the Philistines with Israel and of the oppression of the latter by the Philistine rule (Thenius and De Wette). But in fact no such discrepancy exists. It is by no means said in the first half of chap. vii. 13 that the return of the Philistines was estopped fully, that is, for all time; it is said only that in this battle of Ebenezer they were "subdued or humbled." When then it is added "they came no more into the coast of Israel," that is, they did not repeat their incursions, we need not suppose that the narrator intended to say that the Philistines never again entered the territory of Israel so long as Samuel lived. On the contrary, the historical content is defined by the second half of ver. 13, "and the hand of the Lord was against the Philistines all the days of Samuel." If "the hand of the Lord," that is, His power and might, was against the Philistines all the days of Samuel, this involves the fact that, as long as Samuel lived, the Philistines were hostile to Israel and sought to subdue them, but God defended His people and gave them the victory over their enemies. "The hand of the Lord against the Philistines" supposes strife between Israel and the Philistines, occasioned by the incursions of the latter. What immediately precedes can therefore be understood only in a relative, not in an absolute sense of the Philistines' not coming again into the border of Israel. Otherwise the supposed contradiction would exist in the two parts of ver. 13 itself. The decisive fact, however, in this question is that the words "all the days of Samuel" are to be connected not, as the alleged contradiction supposes, with the first half of ver. 13, but only with the second. It is not said "all the days of Samuel the Philistines did not return," but "all the days of Samuel the hand of the Lord was against the Philistines." The first statement declares, over against the reference to God's power warding off the hostility of the Philistines, and in connection with Samuel's victory over them at Ebenezer, that in consequence of this victory they had not repeated their incursions into the territory of Israel, and this is to be understood of the space of time after the lapse of which they resumed their old wars against Israel. In Saul's victories over them, who, "as long as he lived," had to struggle hard with them (xiv. 52), and whose term of life nearly coincided with that of Samuel, since the latter died only a few years before him, the hand of Jehovah was mighty against them, and the promise of ix. 16 was fulfilled. Israel's condition of shameful subjection portrayed in xiii. 19 sq. was the result of the occupation of the land by the Philistines mentioned in vers. 5 and 6, and does not contradict the statement that Jehovah's hand was against the Philistines "all the days of Samuel," since in chap. xiv. is related how the Lord at that time helped Israel (comp. ver. 23). The solution of the alleged contradiction that restricts the expression "all the days

of Samuel" to the duration of his judicial term, is unsatisfactory from the arbitrariness of this restriction, and conflicts with ver. 15: "Samuel *judged Israel all the days of his life.*"

It is also maintained that there is a contradiction between the section ix. 1–10, 16 and the sections viii., x. 17–27, because in the former Samuel anoints Saul in consequence of a divine revelation, and in the latter has him chosen king by lot in consequence of the demand of the people (DE WETTE). But in truth there is nothing here that compels us to suppose an absolute contradiction; "for in ix. 1—x. 16 is related the secret anointing of Saul by Samuel, with its immediate consequences, and in x. 17–27 the choice by *lot* in the presence of the whole people" (NAEGELSBACH, *ubi sup.* p. 401). THENIUS (*Komm.* 2 *Aufl.* p. 43) seeks to establish the unhistorical character of both narrations by stating the alternative: "the Prophet would then either have tempted God, or have been guilty of an unworthy trick before the people;" but against this we remark that according to x. 17–27 also every thing was done by Samuel at the divine instance and under divine influence (vers. 18, 24), as in the narrative in ix. 1—x. 16, that therefore both tempting God and unworthy trickery on Samuel's part are excluded, since in the narration the choice by lot also is conceived of in a theocratic point of view. In the presence of the assembled people God declares the man who had been chosen and anointed by His will, to be king, and His representative. Comp. Winer, *Bibl. Realwörterbuch*, II. p. 389: "In chap. viii. Samuel declares himself against the wish of the people *by command of Jehovah Himself*, and by His command makes an attempt to divert the Israelites from their desire. This failing, he receives from Jehovah the command to yield (viii. 21 sq.), and anoints Saul, chaps. ix., x. . And then the scene, x. 17 sq., was not superfluous: *the first revelation*, ix. 15 sq., *was for the Prophet; the second*, x. 20 sq., *for the people.*" To this we add EWALD'S remark (*Geschichte des V. Isr.* [Hist. of Israel], III. p. 33, 3 *Aufl.*): "If we bear in mind the ordinary use of the sacred lot in those times, we shall find that in the connection of this narrative (EWALD ascribes vers. 17–27 to the author of the preceding section) nothing but the truth is described in this incident; the mysterious meeting with the Seer did not suffice for the full and benedictive recognition of Saul the king, but publicly also in solemn national assembly it was necessary that the Spirit of Jahveh should choose him before all others and mark him as the man of Jahveh." And so there is no contradiction between ix. 1—x. 16 and x. 17–27, but the two sections stand in concinnate relation to one another.

Another discrepancy has been found between xi. 14 sq. and xiii. 8 compared with x. 8, it being held that the words of Samuel (x. 8) contain a command to Saul to go immediately to Gilgal and wait for him there seven days. On this supposition certainly chaps. viii. and xi. 14 sq. cannot be reconciled, since, according to the latter passage, Saul went to Gilgal not *before* but *with* Samuel, and indeed at his special suggestion, and there was therefore no waiting on Samuel; and moreover, before Saul and Samuel came together in Gilgal, their first meeting after that solemn prophetic consecration of Saul (x. 1–8) took place in Mizpeh. Equally impossible, on this supposition, is a reconciliation of x. 8 and xiii. 8, which last passage contains an undeniable reference to an order given to Saul by Samuel, such as is expressed in x. 8; for between the two there is an interval, according to xiii. 1, of two years. [But the text here (xiii. 1) is corrupt—see note on the verse in question.—TR.] NAEGELSBACH therefore supposes that x. 8 is not in its proper place, but stood originally somewhere just before xiii. 8 (*ubi sup.* p. 401). THENIUS joins xiii. 2 sq. immediately on to x. 16, regarding x. 17—xii. 25 as a section interpolated into the original document between x. 16 and xiii. 2, and xiii. 1 as an interpolation by the Redactor, or perhaps by a later hand, by which the succedent matter was brought into plausible connection with the inserted section, and the necessary time gained for the occurrence narrated in this section (*ubi sup.* p. 49). There are grave objections to both expedients; to the first because of the impossibility of fixing the supposed right place before xiii. 8 where x. 8 is to be put; to the second—apart from the fact that no other reason is given for the supposition that this section is interpolated—because of the chronological difficulty mentioned by KEIL (Introd. I. 236), which undoubtedly presents itself when we look at all which, on this supposition, must have been done (according to xiii. 2–7) within these seven days, and because of the very bold hypothesis that is advanced by

this assumption of an interpolated tradition, and by the explanation of the words of xiii. 1. We have seen what significance the section x. 17–27, in historical connection with what goes before, has for the commencement of Saul's kingdom. KEIL therefore properly asks the question: "How could Saul, secretly anointed by Samuel, and concealing this anointing even from his uncle (x. 1, 16), come to such consideration, that at his call all Israel flocked about him, as about their king, when he had neither been proclaimed king by Samuel, nor by any act had won the confidence of the people for himself as king?" (*ubi supra*). Keil, it is true, from the proposition (which is correct) that the narration in xiii. 1–7 requires for its explanation the content of the section x. 17—xii. 25, draws the conclusion that Samuel's order to Saul in x. 8 refers to the solemn proclamation of Saul as king in Gilgal (xi. 14 sq.); but this conclusion is unsatisfactory on grounds already adduced. And moreover the view which KEIL connects with this conclusion (and which is found as far back as CLERICUS) is untenable—namely, that the statement in xiii. 8 (which has consequently nothing at all to do with x. 8) refers to a command not expressly mentioned, but here casually alluded to in the words "according to the set time that Samuel had appointed," by which Samuel, with reference to the Philistine war, had at a later time ordered Saul to Gilgal; for these very words (as KEIL himself now admits, Comm. *in loco*, 101, 128) plainly point to the injunction given to Saul in x. 8. However, proceeding from this supposition, we are no way bound to explain the words in x. 8 as a command of Samuel which was to be immediately carried out by Saul. The proper explanation of the connection in which the "thou goest down" (וְיָרַדְתָּ) in ver. 8 stands partly with the preceding, partly with the following circumstantial clause introduced by "and behold" (וְהִנֵּה) leads to the conditional rendering "and when thou goest down before me to Gilgal, behold . . . . .;" and a similar translation is found in SEB. SCHMIDT, only with improper temporal extension, and is proposed by EWALD (*Gesch.* 3 *Aufl.* III. 41) and KEIL (Comm. p. 101). The king chosen to deliver Israel from the yoke of the Philistines must recognize it as his first duty to prove his kingly might in battle against the Philistines, in accordance with his consecration received from Samuel. The exhortation to this duty Samuel couples with the command that he should not in the exercise of his royal calling trespass on the field that was to remain closed to him, namely, the offering of sacrifice for the people when they were mustered for war. EWALD says: "Gilgal, on the south-western bank of the Jordan, was then, from all indications, one of the most holy places in Israel, and the true centre of the whole people; it had a like importance before, and much more then, because the Philistine control reached so far eastward* that the middle point of the kingdom must have been pressed back to the bank of the Jordan. There the people must have assembled for all general political questions, and thence after offering and consecration have marched forth armed to war" (*ubi sup.* p. 42). The significance of Gilgal for the whole people at this period of the Israelitish history is presupposed in Samuel's command to Saul, which consequently contains for him the following rule of government: When thou goest down to Gilgal—that is, to gather the people there, that they may be led forth to battle against the Philistines, and to this end receive consecration by solemn offering—thou shalt await my coming for the preparation, and neither in thy own power make the offering, nor of thy own will begin the war against the Philistines. In this prophetic command Saul ought to have recognized the voice of God (see KEIL, *ubi sup.*, pp. 101–103, and EWALD, *ubi sup.*, p. 41–46). This explanation is found as early as BRENZ. He says: "But we are not to understand that Samuel commands Saul to go straightway down to Gilgal and there wait seven days, but that he is to do this after he has been publicly elected king and confirmed in the kingdom by victory over the Ammonites, and shall then begin to prepare for war against the Philistines, on whose account especially Saul was called to the kingdom. The following, therefore, is the meaning of Samuel's command: Thou art called to the kingdom especially to free Israel from the tyranny of the Philistines. When, therefore, thou art about to undertake this work, go down to Gilgal and wait there seven days till I come to thee; then thou shalt offer a sacrifice, but not before I come, and I will show thee what is to be done, that our enemies the

* [EWALD has *west*, but the sense seems to require *east*.—TR.]

Philistines may be conquered; this thing is related afterwards in chap. xiii., where we read that Saul violated this command."

Thenius finds a discrepancy between xiv. 47 and x. 17 sq. and xi. 14 sq. (p. 65), maintaining that here several mutually exclusive relations are put together—that the author of the sections xiv. 47 sq. relates that Saul by this victory over the Philistines proved himself to be the king anointed by Samuel and secured royal authority, and that this cannot be reconciled with x. 17 sq., xi. 14 sq., and xv. But if we recollect that the Philistines had possession of the greater part of the land, the expression לָכַד ["took"] in xiv. 47 is best understood as meaning that Saul by this victory got the real control of the land, not as referring to the public assumption of the kingdom to which he was first designated by the anointing. There is therefore no discrepancy between this statement of the result of the victory over the Philistines and the accounts of Saul's choice by lot (x. 17 sq.), and of his confirmation as king before the whole people in Gilgal (xi. 14 sq).

An apparent anachronism exists in xvii. 54, where it is said that David carried Goliath's head to Jerusalem, while it was some time later that he conquered Jerusalem (2 Sam. v.); but this is explained by the remark of KURZ (HERZOG, *Real-Encycl.*, Art. "David") and others, that, if not the citadel, yet the city of Jerusalem had then been a long time in the possession of the Israelites (Josh. xv. 63; Judg. i. 21), and it is not at all necessary for the establishment of this fact, which makes the deposition (of Goliath's head) possible, to suppose with NAEGELSBACH that David had a prophetic anticipation of the importance of this city, although this supposition is unjustly set aside by THENIUS without further consideration. There is just as little difficulty in the statement that David, after the victory, deposited the armor of Goliath in his tent, while the giant's sword is afterwards found in the Sanctuary at Nob.

Between xviii. 5 and xviii. 13–16 a discrepancy has been found, in that in the first passage David received his appointment as military commander on account of his bravery; in the second on account of Saul's envy and fear of him. The apparent contradiction is set aside, however, by a glance at the intermediate narration, according to which the jealousy aroused in Saul by the women's song of victory produced such a change in his disposition towards David that he assigned the latter a higher post only to remove him from his person and expose him to death in battle against the Philistines.

Between the statements of Jonathan in xix. 2 and xx. 2—the first of which informs David of his father's murderous thoughts against him, while the second assures him of the contrary —there lies an interval, in which Saul's hatred against David might have softened; or at least Jonathan, thinking the best of his father, might believe that he had perceived a change in his disposition towards David. Perhaps Jonathan, as NAEGELSBACH (p. 403) supposes, intends only to deny that another attack against David's life is purposed. Why, in the face of this assurance of his friend, should it be so inconceivable that David should speak of again appearing at the royal table at the appointed time when Saul expected him? Had David not already had experience of similar paroxysms of rage in the king, and yet been always reconciled with him by Jonathan's intervention?

The apparent contradiction between 1 Sam. xviii. 27, where David brings 200 foreskins of the Philistines for Michal, and 2 Sam. iii. 14, which speaks of 100 only, is resolved by referring to 1 Sam. xviii. 25, according to which Saul had demanded the latter number of foreskins; only these, not the two hundred actually brought, are mentioned by David in the later passage.

We turn now to those sections in which there are supposed to exist double accounts of the same thing, in part mutually exclusive and contradictory; that is, signs of the use of various documents, which in respect to the same facts and events, present differences that the Redactor could not reconcile.

First among these is the narrative of the two Goliaths, 1 Sam. xvii. 4, and 2 Sam. xxi. 19. In the one passage David slays the giant Goliath, and in the other it is related of Elhanan, son of Jaare-oregim, that he slew Goliath of Gath, whose spear was like a weaver's beam. It is altogether arbitrary in BOETTCHER (*Neue exegetisch-kritische Æhrenlesen zum A. T.* on 2 Sam. xxi. 19) to try to prove the identity of this Elhanan with David (see THENIUS, p. 259), in order to make this account agree with 1 Sam. xvii. 4 f. Nothing obliges us to re-

gard the two passages as referring to the same incident, since two different actors are mentioned, David and Elhanan, the last with circumstantial reference to his person and descent, and there may well have been at different times two giants of equal strength and the same name, the later perhaps purposely honored with the name of the earlier. But in the parallel passage, 1 Chron. xx. 5, which evidently gives the same event as 2 Sam. xxi. 19, it is said: "Elhanan, the son of Jair, slew Lahmi, the brother of Goliath of Gath, whose spear, *etc.*;" and if the correct reading is *not* in 2 Sam. xxi. 19 (of which I cannot convince myself), but rather in 1 Chr. xx. 5, then the distinctness of the combats related in the two accounts is so much the more beyond doubt (see THENIUS' view, p. 258 sq., which is opposed to his earlier view).

In xix. 9 sq. the same incident seems to be related as in xviii. 9 sq., and therefore the one passage or the other seems to be not in the right place. Yet the double narrative, agreeing literally in single expressions, may be referred without difficulty to two explosions of rage on Saul's part, since according to xviii. sq. this rage showed itself several times against David.

The rejection of Saul is narrated in the two sections, 1 Sam. xiii. 8–14, and xv. 10–26. But nothing requires us to regard these as mutually exclusive narrations of one and the same fact. Rather, the circumstances under which Saul manifests his disobedience are so different in the two cases, that we must recognize two different courses of events in which his disobedience is shown. But, as in the second act of disobedience there lay a heightening of the guilt, so on the first act of the punishment (xiii., xiv.) followed the second sharper act, consisting in the definitive rejection (xv. 23, 24).

There is just as little necessity for referring the parallel narrations in x. 10-12 and xix. 22-24 to the same event. Rather, there is so much in each that is peculiar, that we are justified in assuming two different occurrences in which the proverb "Is Saul also among the prophets?" found its application. The first incident explains its origin, for it is said, x. 12: "Therefore it became a proverb." The second similar incident, which is described as occurring under totally different circumstances, fixed it and gave it a wider application, xix. 24.

THENIUS' grounds (p. 120) for referring to one event the two narratives of the repeated treachery of the Ziphites towards David and David's magnanimous conduct towards Saul (xxiii. 19-24, xxiv. and xxvi.), of which the tradition is supposed to have given a double account, seem *not* sufficient to establish the identity of the two. Their points of agreement do not exclude the distinctness of the events. "For," says NAEGELSBACH (p. 402) justly, "that David twice came to the hill Hachilah near Ziph is probable by reason of the hiding-places in this wooded mountain-range; that the Ziphites twice discovered and betrayed his abode is very natural from their friendship for Saul; and that Saul made a second expedition against David is psychologically only too easily explained, even though he was no moral monster; his hatred against David was so deeply rooted that it could only be repressed for the moment, not destroyed, by that magnanimous deed." David's twice sparing the life of his enemy has its ground in the horror of laying hand on the Lord's anointed, and Saul's consequent double expression of repentance is explained by the change of feeling which is psychologically not hard to understand when we consider his disposition, as it is everywhere represented to us. But, on the other hand, along with these resemblances there are such important differences in the two narratives that the assumption of two events can by no means be regarded as arbitrary. On the particulars comp. HAEVERNICK (p. 138 sq.) and KEIL (*Introd.* I. 243, 244).

The narrative of David's two flights to the Philistines (xxi. 10-15, and xxvii. 1 sq.) is regarded as a double relation of the same event, and is referred to different sources. Thenius (p. 101 sq) finds historical truth only in the second relation of David's flight to Gath (xxvii.), on the ground that David would have fled to the Philistines only in the extremest need, and not at the outset; but certainly according to the account of Saul's pursuit of David, that precedes xxi., the latter's need was great enough to impel him under those circumstances to flee to the Philistines. While the two narratives agree in the fact that David flees to Achish, the differences in everything else are so great that we must suppose not one abode of David with the Philistines (held by THENIUS to be given with historical trustworthiness only in xxvii.) but two distinct occurrences. In xxi. he comes alone to Achish, in

xxvii. with wives and children and a numerous retinue; in the first case, being soon recognized, he had to act the madman in order to save himself, and his stay was short; in the second he settles himself for a long abode in Ziklag, and undertakes several expeditions against the hostile tribes on the southern border of Canaan, whereby he secures the favor and protection of Achish. With such great differences we cannot suppose that the narration in xxi. is a legendary embellishment of that in xxvii.

There are two mentions of the death of Samuel, xxv. 1 and xxviii. 3. We need not, however, suppose that the Redactor took these from two sources. Rather the repetition in xxviii. 3 (which moreover from its language and style does not seem to be an independent account) serves to introduce and illustrate the following narrative as much as the remark that Saul had driven the necromancers and wizards out of the land. "The repetition of the words 'they had lamented him and buried him,' seems designed to put the impiety against Samuel in a still stronger light" (Naegelsb. p. 404).

At the first glance there seem to be two contradictory accounts of Saul's death in 1 Sam. xxxi. 4 and 2 Sam. i. 9, 10, according to the first of which he killed himself, but according to the second was at his own request slain by an Amalekite, who himself brings the report. Ewald (p. 137, 138) supposes here two different and evidently ancient accounts, of which one makes the faithful and conscientious armor-bearer, the other a frivolous and rude Gentile present at the last moment of the sinking hero; the first the account of those who spoke well, the second that of those who spoke ill of Saul; but this supposition of two sources and two accounts is untenable because of the fact which comes out from the narrative in 2 Sam. i. that the Amalekite falsely ascribed the deed to himself in order to receive thanks and recognition therefor from David, but especially to get a large reward for Saul's jewels, of which he had possessed himself (Then. p. 141).

There is just as little ground for holding that the narratives of the conquest of the Syrians, 2 Sam. viii. and x.—xii. are two relations of the same expedition of David against the Syrians, as Gramberg (*Religionsid.* II. 108) has maintained. He would allow only *one* conquest, because after such a defeat they could not have so soon recovered themselves, and in ch. x. also there is no mention of a revolt of the Syrians, while yet according to ch. viii. they had been really subdued. But the resources of the Syrians, even after that defeat, may have been ample (comp. viii. 4, 7, 8, 10); for the rich booty that the Israelites got, and the large number of warriors that the Syrians had put into the field, point to considerable power and wealth. But there was no need to mention their revolt, since it was understood as a matter of course that they sought to shake off the yoke at the first opportunity, though otherwise the yoke was so firmly fixed that one could speak of a real and permanent subjection; this opportunity offered itself when the Ammonites went into a war with David. And so they appear in ch. x. not as independent enemies of David, but as allies of the Ammonites (comp. Theod. *quæst.* 24 *ad.* 2 *Reg.;* Winer, *Realwörterb.* I. 260; Then. p. 188). Ewald in like manner maintains (III. 204, 205) the identity of the Syrian war, viii. 3, with the Syrian-Ammonitish in x. sq. In support of this view he urges that the war with the Syrian King Hadad-Ezer of Zobah cannot be explained except by supposing that it was excited by a contemporaneous war with a nearer kingdom, since the kingdom of Zobah is not described as bordering immediately on the kingdom of Israel. But, it is said, according to x.—xii., a great Syrian war with Israel was excited by the Ammonites; this war with Ammon is narrated there at greater length on account of the history of Uriah, and for this reason is only mentioned quite incidentally, viii. 12, in the general account of all the great wars. But it is sufficiently clear from viii. 3 how David came immediately into conflict with the Syrians without occasion thereto having been given by war with another enemy. Thenius (*in loco*) well says: "David's aim was to rest his kingdom at one point at least on the Euphrates, because this was the nearest stream that traversed broad tracts of country; on the way thither Hadad-Ezer, whose territory he touched on in the march, opposed him." It is true that the Ammonite war, briefly mentioned in ch. viii. is, on account of the pragmatism which controls the whole narrative in x.—xii., given at length for the reason assigned; but if the Syrian war mentioned in viii. 3 occurred along with this Ammonite war, as is maintained, it

is surprising that this connection is not indicated in ch. viii. in the list of wars, but the two are introduced as wholly distinct. We therefore have in chs. viii. and x. sq. accounts of altogether different wars.

With the sections xvi. 14-23, xvii. 12-51, and xvii. 55-58, the case is different from that of the passages hitherto discussed, in which contradictions or mutually exclusive accounts of the same fact, and therefore indications of various documents, have been supposed to exist; here indeed incongruences and discrepancies do exist, and signs of different documents, which the author has put together, must be recognized. In xvi. 18 is related how David comes to Saul, and his extraction and his father's name are exactly and fully given. On the other hand, in xvii. 12, after the dangerous and disgraceful situation has been pictured, in which Israel stood in reference to the Philistines, and as the object of their giant Goliath's scorn, in a new section, which begins here, David is spoken of as if he had not been named at all before, and the names of his father and native city are given. This second mention of his family-relations, particularly in this shape, cannot be explained without forcing and far-fetched conceits, as in HAEVERNICK's attempt (p. 135). The author, says he, purposely repeats the notices of David's race and extraction, partly because this fits in with the historical narration, to which the explanation of David's coming into the camp, *etc.*, can thus be attached, partly because the importance that he attaches to his hero thus comes out more strongly, and his person again comes clearly before the reader. The appeal to similar peculiarities in Hebrew historiography (as in other places in the Books of Samuel) is of no force in this passage, because such genealogical statistical-historical summary notices are given usually only as conclusion in important historical turning-points, and chiefly as proleptical statements (comp. 1 Sam. vii. 15-17; xiv. 47-52). The strange הַזֶּה ["this"] in xvii. 12, shows clearly that it is added to the already superfluous genealogical notice of David in order to connect the section vers. 12-31 with xvi. 14-23, to which (especially ver. 18) regard must have been had in ver. 12. That it is added with this view is clearly seen from its incongruity with the following וּשְׁמוֹ יִשַׁי [and his name was Jesse]. NAEGELSBACH's remark (p. 402) is perfectly correct: "If הַזֶּה ['this'] is meant to point to the earlier mention of the name in ch. xvi., then the וּשְׁמוֹ ['and his name'] is superfluous; and if the latter remains, the former is superfluous."—So also the statement in v. 15, that David went back and forth from Saul to keep his father's sheep in Bethlehem, makes the impression that it was appended to the account before us in order to bring this narrative into agreement with xvi. 21-23, according to which David was constantly with Saul as his armor-bearer, and to explain the fact that he came from his father's folds to the scene of war. Long ago exception was taken to the disagreement between xvii. 12-31 and xvi. The proof is that the former is altogether lacking in the Vatican recension of the Septuagint, and that ORIGEN found it in no Greek translation. Similar difficulty was felt with xvii. 55 sq., which is also omitted in the Vatican Septuagint.

Between the section (xvii. 55 sq.) and xiv. 16-23 there is the discrepancy that in the former Saul does not know David, while according to the latter he must have known not only him personally, but also his lineage. According to xiv. 16 sq. David was described to Saul at the outset as the son of Jesse of Bethlehem, and Saul had put himself in communication with David's father by repeated messages, in order to take David permanently into his service. Contrariwise in xvii. 55 sq. he repeatedly asks: Whose son is the youth? Various attempts have been made to resolve this discrepancy. Stress has been laid on the fact that he asks not after David's person, but after his lineage. Then, according to one view, this question expresses the contempt and scorn which Saul would assign as reason why he could not keep his splendid promise (xvii. 25) to such a man of mean descent (HAEV. p. 136); but in neither case does the form of the question justify such a construction. According to another explanation the question expresses astonishment and admiration (KEIL, *Introd.* I. 238); but then it could not be "whose son is the youth?" We should expect, "is this the son of Jesse?" By others it is regarded as more probable that Saul had forgotten David's family-relations, either in the rush and press of court-life (SAURIN), or from hypochondria (BERTH.), or from ingratitude (Calvin) or from forgetfulness (KEIL *in loco*), and KEIL con-

jectures that Saul, on account of the promised release of the victor from taxes, wished to know more of David's connections than simply his father's name and his birth-place; but all this does not suffice to set aside the difference, least of all the last-mentioned expedient, because David's answer to Saul's question contains likewise nothing more than the name of his father; and so recourse is had arbitrarily to a new hypothesis, namely, that David's answer has not been fully reported, though even this, strictly taken, would not suffice for that view, but would render necessary still another supposition, namely, that Saul's question is not fully reported. Since all these attempts at solution are untenable, we cannot, in the present state of the investigation of this question, avoid supposing, with many expositors, that the author of our Books has in these sections interpolated a second written tradition which he met with of David's battle with Goliath, and, although he connected them with ch. xvi. by a slight revision, the traces of which are indicated above, yet did not undertake a more thorough alteration for the purpose of reconciling the differences (WINER, II. 260; BLEEK, p. 364; NAEGELSB. *u. s.* p. 402). The supposition of an interpolation of the section xvii. 12 sq. (MICH., EICH., BERTHOLDT), which is also the ground of its omission in the Septuagint and other Greek translations, is untenable in proportion to the difficulty of understanding why an interpolation that offered great difficulties should be made.

On a closer examination of the question as to the extent of the second account that the author had before him, and the manner in which he combined it with his narrative, it appears in the first place that the incongruence and discrepancy (in relation to the preceding, xvi. 14-23) does not pertain to the whole of ch. xvii. This chapter (xvii.) is really connected closely with the preceding narration in xiv., since, after Saul's rejection and David's selection have been related, it resumes the account of Saul's wars with the Philistines, which remained his life-task (xiv. 52) even after his rejection (comp. EWALD, *Gesch.* III. 95, 3d ed.). The contents of vers. 32-54 connect themselves well without incongruence or discrepancy with the account (xvi. 14) of the calling of the already anointed David to the royal court, which stands in pragmatic connection with the rejection of Saul, since the gloomy spirit which governs Saul comes over him in consequence of his rejection by God—with the narrative of his establishment in Saul's service as armor-bearer (ver. 21), which on the one hand is brought about by David's military capacity (ver. 18), and on the other hand sufficiently explains his presence with Saul in the camp—and especially with xvii. 11; and that the section vers. 12-31 was added by the author from another narration to complete the account of David, is the more evident from the עָלָיו of ver. 32 ("let no man's heart fail *because of him*"), which is closely connected with ver. 11, where the Philistine Goliath is spoken of, while he is not mentioned in the immediately preceding verses, and especially from the content of David's speech to Saul in ver. 32 ("let no man's heart fail") which naturally belongs to ver. 11 ("they were dismayed and greatly afraid").—We must also regard the section vers. 55-58 as a piece interpolated by the author, which is taken from another account, and the point of which lies in the twice-put question of Saul. From its first words it ought to have stood after ver. 40; but as Saul's question could be answered by Abner only after David's return from the combat, it was put here after ver. 54, its first half, vers. 55, 56, forming an appendix to ver. 40, since according to the sense the verbs are to be regarded as in the pluperfect, and the second half, vers. 57, 58, serving as continuation of the history after ver. 54. By the statement that David *after* this discourse before Saul had formed a friendship with Jonathan, the author has so connected this section with the following (xviii. 1 sq.) that he relates in ver. 2 (in reference to the remark in ver. 15) how David in consequence of his heroic exploit was taken permanently into Saul's service and received from him a military command. WINER says rightly (I. 260): "Ch. xviii. 1-5 may very well belong to the proper substance of the Book, only the collector has attached this section to the interpolated ch. xvii." though, as we have seen, not all of ch. xvii. is to be regarded as interpolation of the author, but only vers. 12-31. On the whole passage we may compare EWALD's remark: "We hold that the older narrator also mentioned the single combat of David with Goliath; the passages xviii. 6, xix. 5, xxi. 10, leave no doubt of this; and the words that describe the

last issue of the deed (xviii. 1, 3-5) are, according to their coloring, from the older narrator" (*ubi sup.* p. 96, 97).*

As characteristic of the fact that the content of the Books of Samuel has been "put together in compilatory fashion" from various sources by a Redactor of historical accounts, it has been declared (THENIUS, p. IX.), that some parts of the work by their curt chronicle-like tone stand in striking contrast with the elsewhere elaborate, in one part (2 Sam. xi.–xx.) quite biographical narration, for ex. 2 Sam. v. 1–16; viii.; xxi. 15–22; xxiii. 8–39. This is true only in part of the first-named passage; for it is elaborately and distinctly enough told how David at Hebron receives homage as king over all Israel, and then makes *Jerusalem* his capital by driving out the Jebusites. The rest of the section and the others adduced have certainly, if not exactly a chronicle-like, yet a statistical-historical, form. But what is their content? Statistical statements concerning the life and government of David with reference to his previous and subsequent rule, and concerning the children born to him at *Jerusalem* (v. 4, 5, 13-16), summary mention of the wars carried on with foreign enemies (viii.), survey of the wars carried on with the Philistines (xxi. 15-22), a list of David's heroes (xxiii. 8-39). How is this fact, the presence of such chronicle-like statistical passages (the number of which might be increased), to be used? Shall the charge of external mechanical compilation be brought against the Redactor? NAEGELSB. admirably says: "No author is under obligation to treat all parts of his work with equal elaborateness" (401). This holds as a general remark. As to particulars, a fuller account of David's wives and children (v. 13-16) was, for the author's aim, quite useless, if not impossible. In ch. v., where David becomes king over all Israel, the mention of his age and the length of his reign, on which the writer could not pertinently enlarge much, and of his family connections formed in Jerusalem, was quite appropriate, but an elaborate historical account was excluded by the nature of the case. In ch. viii. it did not accord with the author's plan to give a minute and particular account of all the wars against foreign peoples; he contented himself with a nervous, brief and summary description somewhat variously colored. A similar sketch is xxi. 15-22. And the list of heroes in xxiii. cannot in itself make at all against the literary character of the author, especially as xxi.–xxiv. is an unconnected appendix to the Second Book. In fact, however, such diversities cannot detract from the general unity. Or, is weight laid on them in order to prove that the author drew from various sources? Of this certainly these differences furnish sufficient proof. Of course in these sections the author had to take his chronological, genealogical and statistical-historical statements from various sources. We must indeed recognize here the traces either of various documents corresponding to the several sections, or of a written collection of notes on which the composition is based.

It is further maintained that "in several places there is clearly a *conclusion* of separate component parts, as 1 Sam. vii. 15-17; xiv. 47-52; 2 Sam. viii. 15-18; xx. 23-26; where the *various* authors briefly stated what further they knew of the persons whose history they were sketching." It is quite certain that these passages have the form of a conclusion in reference

* [It is true, as Dr. ERDMANN shows, that xvii. 12-31 and xvii. 55-58 are probably sections added by the redactor to the old narrative, which embraced xvii. 1-11, 32-54, but it is not necessary to suppose a contradiction between the several sections and xvi. 14-23. The explanations criticised in the text are unsatisfactory, but there is another which diminishes the difficulty as far as we can expect, considering the antiquity of the accounts. It is this: the section, xvi. 14-23, gives a general anticipatory account (which is quite in the Heb. style) of David's relation to Saul, extending as far as the occurrences narrated in ch. xviii.; ch. xvii. then describes the particular incident that led to David's promotion, the immediate results of which are given (also by anticipation) in xviii. 1-5; then the narrative goes back in xviii. 6 to mention an incident which gives the key to the following history. Thus ch. xvii. belongs in time *within* xvi. 14-23, as xviii. 6 belongs in time within xviii. 1-5; the combat with Goliath was the means of procuring Saul's special favor for David, and so Saul, having seen him only a few times, might easily fail to recognize him. So, too, David's "going and returning," xvii. 15, is to be put in the early part of the period embraced in xvi. 14-23, and is not inconsistent with the permanent service which appears at the close of the period, the explanation of which is given in ch. xvii. For fuller explanation see the exposition *in loco*.—The obscurity of the narrative in the connection of the different sections is due no doubt to its brevity and to our ignorance of certain circumstances, which, if known, would enable us clearly to see harmony in these different accounts. The supposition of contradictory accounts is in itself very improbable, considering the fact that the events were well known and carefully recorded by competent persons. It is therefore wiser to suppose an omission of connecting facts than a contradiction in the recorded accounts.—TR.]

to what precedes. Up to 1 Sam. vii. 14 has been related how Samuel exercised his judicial office, and Israel under his lead gained a brilliant victory over the Philistines. At this point in the history he has reached the apex of his judicial activity; here the period proper of the Judges ends, and the history turns to the new-beginning period of the Kings, in which indeed Samuel with his judicial authority is still a power; not, however, as before, sole ruler, but God's instrument to carry out the idea of the theocratic kingdom, about which the whole following history turns. This was then the place, in the description of Samuel as judicial ruler, in which was summarily and in conclusion (and at the same time proleptically) condensed all that was to be said about his judicial rule, in order that the history, abandoning the point of view heretofore maintained, might turn to the beginning of the royal rule and to Samuel's work, so far as it centred in this rule.

In the section 1 Sam. xiv. 47-52 we have a similar critical point in the connection of the theocratical development of history. This section contains in like manner general comprehensive and closing remarks on Saul, partly on his wars, partly on his family and household connections, partly on his constant activity in war against the Philistines (vers. 47, 48, 49-51, 52). Reference is made proleptically to the wars against the Amalekites and Philistines, which are afterwards narrated; this forms the connection with what follows; but in the way of conclusion, looking back to viii.-xiv., everything that remains to be said in general of Saul is brought together here, because by the before-mentioned victory over the Philistines, he stands on the summit of his royal power, which God committed to him against this enemy; but at this moment also, in consequence of the judgment already pronounced against him by Samuel in xiii. (on which follows in xv. the definitive announcement of rejection), begins to decline from that elevation on which as chosen of the Lord he is by his own fault unable to remain. Returning to Samuel's prophetic and theocratic position, there begins (after that closing section) in xv. and xvi. with the narration of the rejection of Saul and the choice of David a new period in the history of the theocratic kingdom, in which David is the central figure, and first in the large section, xv.-xxxi., is described his gradual ascent through conflict and suffering to the throne, along with the gradual, truly heart-rending descent of Saul till his shameful downfall in battle with the Philistines.

Again in the section 2 Sam. viii. there is a critical point [abschluss] in the hitherto splendidly advancing history of David's kingship. In a theocratical sense David here finds himself on the summit of the royal majesty bestowed on him by God, after he has established the Ark permanently in the secure capital, received the promise of permanent lordship for his House, and poured out his soul in thanksgiving to the Lord (vi. and vii.). On the other hand, there here begins by his own fault his gradual decline from this height (x., xi.). At this turning point, as in Saul's history, a summary view of all David's wars is given (vers. 1-14), in ver. 15 his work as king is stated generally, and in vers. 16-18 a general statement of the government and its officers is made, in order that the history may now turn to the new phase of retrogressive development, and from the Ammonite-Syrian war on, which is proleptical, mentioned in this closing section, and during which occurred the grave sin of David that determined all that followed, the sad consequences of this sin in the royal family and in the kingdom may be traced uninterruptedly up to the restoration of the shattered royal power.

At the close of this connected history there follows again a summary and closing statement respecting the government of the thoroughly shaken and broken kingdom, 2 Sam. xx. 23-26. The disagreement between this list of officers and viii. 16-18 is explained very simply by the changes that had occurred in the interval. It is worthy of remark, that in both Joab, the highest officer in the army, stands first, and so both lists in the offices here named really attach themselves closely to the preceding relations of the wars by which internal peace, as condition of an orderly administration of internal affairs, was secured for the kingdom.

A similar character and aim belong to the section 2 Sam. v. 13-16. Here are given David's family connections in Jerusalem at the important point in the advancing development of his kingly authority, when he obtains the rule over all Israel, fixes his royal resi-

dence in Jerusalem, and enters on a new phase of historical development, which is indicated by the three following facts: Vanquishing the Philistines by the hand of the Lord (v. 17-25), Tranference of the Ark to Jerusalem (vi.), and Nathan's prophecy of the building of the temple and of the everlasting rule (vii.).

We see in these sections the same peculiarity of Hebrew historical writing that shows itself, for example, also in the composition of Genesis, namely, that general remarks on household and family affairs and other things not decisive for the principal design of the history form a summary and often anticipatory close to the preceding narrative and the preparation for the transition to a new phase of historical development. Comp. EWALD, *Gesch.* [*Hist. of Israel*], 3d ed., I. 212, 213. Although, then, a certain conclusional character must be recognized in the above-cited sections of our books, it does not *thence* follow that the connected narrations to which they belong pertain to *just as many different documents*, as if the indication were therein given of different authors of the individual parts. In accordance with this view Ewald remarks (*ubi sup.*, p. 212, 3d ed.) that in his explanation of 1 Sam. vii. it is not of consequence "whether the words there are to be referred to our narrator or the following one." The author of our books could himself select these closing sections, and from the character of the content, it is evident that he drew from appropriate historical sources which were at his command. KEIL excellently remarks (*Comm. on Sam. Introd.* 6); "These concise statements are anything but proofs of a compilation from various sources, for which they have been taken from ignorance of the peculiarities of Shemitic historical writing; they serve to round off the different periods into which the history is divided, and furnish points of rest which neither destroy the real connection of the separate groups, nor render the authorial unity of the Books doubtful."

If now we examine our Books more closely in their purely *historical character* or according to the purely *historical point of view*, they lack, in the first place, a strictly chronological statement and arrangement of the facts. In general, precise chronological statements are wanting here, such, for example, as are very carefully given in the Books of Kings; and so it is not the principle of chronological order that controls the connection of the narrative, but the principle of the real connection of things in the grouping of facts, in favor of which the chronological order is infringed. Saul's victory over the Amalekites is mentioned in 1 Sam. xiv. 47, 48, and it is not till xv. that the history of the war against them is narrated, because, as we have seen, it is the design of the author here to group and bring together proleptically everything relating to Saul's foreign wars and family connections, in order afterwards to relate at length Saul's grave sin, which occurred during the Amalekite war, and which, as the cause of his rejection by God, forms the crisis of his history.—In the same way the chronological-historical order is interrupted in 2 Sam. viii., where the author, in giving a general view of all David's foreign wars, mentions proleptically the Ammonite-Syrian war [which he afterwards (chapter x.) relates at length] because it stands at an important turning-point in David's history, when, in consequence of his great sin, a series of divine judgments is prepared for him. The absence of chronological order is especially marked in 2 Sam. xxi.–xxiv.; neither is the beginning, ch. xxi., attached chronologically to ch. xx., nor do the separate parts stand in chronological connection. The section xxiii. 8-39 belongs, according to time and content, to 2 Sam. v. 1-10, which position, answering to the historical connection, it actually has in 1 Chron. xi. The passage xxi. 15-22, in spite of the עוֹד ["yet again"], which points to the just preceding narrative, cannot be connected in time with ver. 14, but belongs chronologically probably to the passage indicated in 1 Chron. xx. 4 sq. (where are mentioned three of the four deeds of heroes here related), namely, 2 Sam. xii. 30, 31 (comp. with 1 Chron. xx. 2, 3). The thanksgiving song of David, ch. xxii., is evidently not in its right place, but belongs, according to the clue which the content gives to the occasion, to a time when David was saved by a great war from grievous distress and danger. That ch. xxiv. is not in its proper chronological position is evident.

Similar inequalities and interruptions show themselves, as in the *chronological*, so also in the *factual* treatment of the historical material.—To look at the last portion, chs. xxi.—xxiv., one would have expected that the two narratives, xxi. 1-14 and xxiv., on account of

the similarity of their points of view and the theocratical tendency which they both show in reference to God's anger, which is to be appeased, would have been put together as they in content belong together. So, the sections xxi. 15-22 and xxiii. 8-39 belong together according to historical content, but are separated by the lyrical-prophetical pieces, xxii. and xxiii. 1-7, which in content belong together. Apart from the chronological point of view, xxiii. 8-39 seems to be detached from the section, 2 Sam. v. 1-10, to which, according to content, it belongs. It is thus in some cases true, that the historical material, even apart from chronological order, is not grouped in relation to its facts, as we should have expected from the similarity of the contents and the points of view.—Further, we several times find references to facts which are assumed to be known, but are not mentioned either in these books or in any others that have been handed down. For example, in 1 Sam. xiii. 2, in the narrative of Saul's military undertakings against the Philistines, Jonathan suddenly appears as leader of part of the army, and defeats the Philistines in their camp at Gibeah, though he had not before been mentioned as Saul's son (this is not done till ver. 16 and xiv. 1), or as taking part in the campaign against the Philistines. So in 1 Sam. xxi. 1 the removal of the tabernacle to Nob is pre-supposed, though we are not told when and how it had been carried thither from Shiloh, where it still stood under Eli (i. 3, 9). The history of the expiation, 2 Sam. xxi., whose omission David had to supply, supposes the occasioning event, the slaying of the Gibeonites by Saul, though it has nowhere been mentioned. So reference is made to the expulsion of necromancers by Saul (1 Sam. xxviii. 3), and to the flight of the Beerothites to Gittaim (2 Sam. iv. 3), which incidents are not narrated. Thus historical facts are here and there in the narration merely taken for granted, the relation of which we should have expected for the sake of completeness and pragmatical connection.

In regard to the fulness of the narrative, it must be particularly remarked, that the Books do not propose to give a properly biographical account of Samuel, Saul and David. The historical material of Samuel's life, regarded from a biographical point of view, is very sporadically and atomically given; there are wanting large parts of the life-development of the prophet. In regard to Saul we find important facts either wholly unmentioned or only briefly touched on or intimated. From a comparison of our Books with the parallel passages in the Books of Chronicles on David, it appears that our author has used less freely than the author of Chronicles the historical material which lay equally before both. The account that our Book gives of the wars of David with the Ammonites and Syrians (2 Sam. viii., x.) leaves out many things that the Chronicler inserts (1 Chron. xviii., xix.). It is not supposable that the history of the preparations for the building of the Temple, the organization of the priestly service and of the army was unknown to our author; but he says nothing about what is contained in 1 Chron. xxii.—xxviii. Even the account of David's end, for which we cannot suppose a lack of material, is wanting, an unexpected omission in a history of David that elsewhere goes so minutely into particulars. We see, therefore, that the author purposed neither to insist on strict chronological arrangement of facts, nor to work up his known or accessible historical material with all possible completeness in *all* parts of his narration. This eclectic treatment of the historical material has its ground in the desire to give special prominence to those things only which were important for the development of the Kingdom of God from a theocratic-prophetical point of view. Thus, for example, in 1 Sam. iii. a fact in the history of Samuel's childhood is made prominent and related at length, that was decisive for his divine call to the prophetic office in contrast with the corrupt priesthood. So the Amalekite war and the Ammonite war (1 Sam. xv. and 2 Sam. x., xi.) are given in full, because in the first we have the ground of Saul's rejection, and in the second the sin of David, on account of which a heavy judgment afterwards falls on his house and kingdom (of which a full relation is given), has its historical background and its factual occasion.

We come once more to the close of the Books, 2 Sam. xxi.—xxiv. In the examination of this conclusion in reference to the arrangement and combination of the historical material, two things strike us: first, that these four chapters are not connected with what precedes by a continuity of historical development, but form a supplement or appendix composed of bits without historical connection among themselves, and second, that with such a conclusion

the history of David is not rounded off by a continuation to the end of his life or even of his reign.

If we compare the six sections in this closing supplement (1, the famine and the atonement, xxi. 1-14; 2, summary account of deeds of heroes in the Philistine wars, xxi. 15-22; 3, David's song of praise, xxii.; 4, David's last words, xxiii. 1-7; 5, David's heroes in conflict with the Philistines, xxiii. 8-39; 6, the plague in consequence of the numbering of the people, and the atonement, xxiv.), 1 and 6, 2 and 5, 3 and 4, correspond in content. The sections 1 and 6 have an objective-theocratical tone, and are therefore to be referred to sources that owed their origin to the theocratic stand-point of the historical narration. Two sins against the Lord: one king Saul's, whose consequences reach to the time of David's reign, the other king David's, which falls in the last period of his reign (Ewald and Then.), have for their results judgments which affect the whole people; in both cases an atonement has to be made in order to appease the wrath of God. The sections 2 and 5, which correspond in their military character, and especially in their reference to the Philistine wars, have an annalistic or chronicle-like tone, and point to corresponding sources. The two-fold utterance of David (3 and 4), forming the centre of this supplement, has the same theocratic-religious tone with its two border-pieces (1 and 6), only with the subjective modification proper to the lyric-prophetic content, and points perhaps to the same source from which the author has woven in the other lyrical pieces of his history. (On this point see further below.) Along with this correspondence in the pairs of sections in the characteristic peculiarities of their content, we may discover, perhaps, in spite of the lack of pragmatic connection between them, a partially *ideal* combination of them in the conception of the author. The summary account of the Philistine wars (xxi. 15-22)—for which in the reverse direction we might find a point of attachment, though a loose one, in the reference in ver. 12 to the earlier Philistine wars under Saul—has an *ideal* pragmatic connection with the following thanksgiving-song; for in xxii. 1 the author, thinking, no doubt, of the principal enemies of Israel, who at the same time represented all the rest, marks this song as addressed to Jehovah at a time "when Jehovah had delivered him out of the hand of all his enemies." In this combination, therefore, chap. xxii. has in that section (xxi. 15-22) its historical basis and illustration. The song composed by David on a definite historical occasion is placed here by the author as a song of triumph, that it may form the cap-stone of the war-tossed life of David. The reflection on the glorious conclusion of all military undertakings against foes, which filled up the greater part of David's reign, led the author on to David's last prophetic word, which is the culmination of his inner life, where, as prophet, on the ground of the everlasting covenant which God had made with him, he foretells salvation under the righteous ruler, who was to proceed from his house. Thenius rightly sees in this song "the last poetical flight that David ever took, to be put perhaps shortly before his death," and says that it can hardly be doubted that we have here David's swan-song (p. 271, 275). It is appropriate to our aim in making a close examination of this song here—namely, to fix the characteristics of the arrangement of this supplementary section—to quote Ewald's admirable words: "In the song which an old tradition rightly calls 'the last (poetical) words of David,' the poetical and ethical spirit of the aged king is at last completely transfigured into the prophetical; once more before his death rising to a poetic flight he feels himself in truth Jehovah's prophet, and looking back on his now closing life, he announces, as with a free outlook into the future the divine presentiment he felt that the rule of his house, firmly fixed in God, would outlast his death" (*Gesch.* III. 268). In regard to the prophetic element, Keil says still better (*Comm.* p. 484sq.): "These 'last words' are the divine attestation of all that he has sung and prophesied in several Psalms of the everlasting rule of his seed, founded on the divine promise announced to him by the prophet Nathan, chap. vii. For these words are no mere lyric expansion of that divine promise, but a prophetical declaration which David made in the evening of his life by divine inspiration concerning the true King of the Kingdom of God." The author has taken the list of heroes, xxiii. 8-39, out of its (according to 1 Chr. xi. 10) original connection, where, according to its superscription, it illustrated the establishment of David's kingdom over all Israel in victorious battle against enemies by the help of his he-

roes, and put it into this place, perhaps in order to give a historical framework to David's last word concerning the glory of his kingdom in its exhibition of power against its ungodly opposers, inasmuch as it had a historical foundation. The two statistical-historical sections, xxi. 15 sq. and xxiii. 8 sq., would therefore form an appropriate frame for the two pictures (xxii. and xxiii. 1-7) which in their contents are so important for the history of David's kingdom.

There is a similar ideal connection between chaps. xxiv. and xxiii. 8-39; for the narrative of the census, made in a spirit of haughty self-elevation to ascertain David's military strength, connects itself factually with the list of his heroes, and also with chap. xxi., to which it points by the opening words "and *again* the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel," and by the closing words in ver. 25 (comp. chap. xxi. 14), since it relates a similar case of royal sin and the consequently necessary appeasing of God's anger.

Further, there is an ideal connection between the close of this passage (ver. 25 and Septuagint comp. with 1 Chr. xxi. 27—xxii. 1), where Araunah's threshing-floor is represented as the place on which, after the building of an altar by David, the Temple was built, and the passage xxiii. 1–7. In the latter the author presents David gazing in prophetical perspective on the glory of the House which God will build for him in righteousness in the future of his kingdom; in the former he shows us how, under divine guidance, the place where David builds an altar to the Lord, brings the expiatory offering, and receives the answer to his prayer for the staying of the pestilence, is selected for the building of the Temple, which is to become the permanent place of God's abode and His gracious presence with His people, yet, by the Lord's express command, is to be built for the Lord as His house, not by David, but by his son.

Finally it is generally agreed that the chief part at least of this section, chaps. xxi.—xxiv. belongs to the later period of David's life. Thus EWALD characterizes the two plagues (xxi. 1-14 and xxiv.) and the great song of triumph (xxii.) as evidently pertaining to David's last years. "The last words of David" (xxiii. 1-7) put it beyond doubt that the author was here looking at the close of David's reign.

From this examination it appears that it is at least inexact to say that "chaps. xxi.—xxiv. are very loosely and externally connected, and are put at the end only that the author might here add the sections that seemed to him important for David's life, and for which he had before found no fitting place" (so HAEVERNICK, p. 180). It is true the connected narrative of David's life closed with the description of the complete quelling of Absalom's revolt, with which is connected the insurrection of Sheba (2 Sam. xx. 1-32). But the author did not intend this to be the real conclusion of his whole history, so that we should have to regard chaps. xxi.—xxiv. merely as an appended collection which he had at first intended to omit (EWALD, *Gesch.* III. 239); rather he purposed giving in these sections the proper conclusion of his history of David's reign; not, however, by presenting a connected and full narrative of the occurrences in the last period of his reign, but by gathering up these events of David's later life under the loftiest points of view, which control the whole history from the first, and appending them as its conclusion. We have here, not an appendix that is brought in at the conclusion (NAEGELSBACH, 409), but an appendix that is itself conclusion, as the principal facts in the content show.

Before, however, we establish the sense in which the author intended to close his history with this section, we must consider an objection urged by many—namely, that as there is no account of David's death, the Books of Samuel have no proper conclusion; thus we shall discover the point of view under which the continuation of a connected narrative of David's life up to his death is omitted at the end of our Books. From the stand-point of ordinary biographical-historical narration, this fact—that at the close of a so elaborate and in part biographical narrative of David's life, his death is not mentioned—is certainly strange. It cannot be explained by the supposition that the author's materials did not reach to the death of David; for the Redactor of our Books certainly wrote after David's death, and needed no special authority to conclude with a reference to that event. Nor is it an explanation to say that the author wrote shortly after David's death, and from his proximity to this generally

known event, did not care to impart it to his contemporaries (HAEVERNICK, p. 145); for, aside from the incorrect presupposition in this view, it is inconceivable that the author should have been silent about the decease of this great king after having so elaborately described his life-course in its several stadia. So also we must reject the hypothesis that the author of the Books of Samuel has in this work of his at least in part treated the history of Solomon, of which much is retained in the beginning (chaps. i. and ii.) of the Books of Kings (BLEEK, *Einl.* [Introd.], pp. 359, 360)—that in these two chapters the thread of the narrative in the Books of Samuel is continued without break by the account of the death of David and the accession of Solomon, as EWALD maintains (*Gesch.* I. p. 207 sq., 239 sq.), assuming that the first half of his supposed great work on the Kings reached up to 1 Kings ii. If the similarity of the style of the narration be insisted on in support of this view, this is sufficiently explained by the common source from which both drew (1 Chr. xxix. 29). If appeal is made to the similarity of particular narratives, for example, 1 Sam. ii. 27-36 compared with 1 Kings ii. 26 sq., it being maintained that the same writer who in the first passage recounts the threatening prophecy of the fall of the House of Ithamar, has in the second recounted its fulfilment in the removal from the priesthood of Abiathar (great-great-grandson of Eli) by Solomon immediately after his accession, and in confirmation of this view reference being made to the repetition of the threat against Eli in 1 Sam. iii. 11-14—all that we can thence safely conclude is that the author of 1 Kings was acquainted with the Books of Samuel which were written long before his time. The same remark holds of the comparison of 1 Kings ii. 11 with 2 Sam. v. 4, 5 in respect to the similar accounts of David's reign, which were taken from the same source, and also of the reference of 1 Kings viii. 18, 25 to the author of 2 Sam. vii. 12-16. Moreover it is an objection to this view that, if the first chapters of the Books of Kings form the continuation of 2 Sam. xx. 26 by the same author, the section 2 Sam. xxi.—xxiv. intervenes in a strange and unaccountable way, while, on the other hand, these two chapters (1 Kings i. ii.) stand in pragmatic connection with chap. iii., since they form the introduction to the narrative of Solomon's accession (comp. BAEHR [in LANGE'S *Bible-work*], *Komm. zu den BB. der Könige, Einl.* p. 14 [American transl., p. 10]). Nägelsbach says well (p. 408 sq.), against EWALD'S assumption of 1 Kings ii. 46 as the end of the first half of the Book of Kings, that if the original limit of the narrative of the Books of Samuel is to be sought outside of 2 Sam. xxiv. 25, it should rather be in 1 Kings ii. 12, where, after the statement of the length of David's reign, it is said: "then sat Solomon on the throne of David his father, and his kingdom was established greatly," for this passage with the immediately preceding verses has all the marks of a great epoch-making conclusion,—but if, on account of the undeniable relationship of the preceding and succeeding context, the line cannot be drawn here (EWALD for this reason does not put it here), still less can it be drawn at chap. ii. 46.

The present conclusion of the Books of Samuel (wanting the narrative of the death of David) is satisfactorily explained only by the point of view in which they, as well as the Books of Kings, are composed. If it had been the author's object from a biographical-historical point of view to write an elaborate and complete life of David, he would necessarily have narrated its end. But the point of view which controls his whole account, and according to which he groups his historical material, is the *theocratic-prophetic*, and through the *whole* history the characteristic features not only of its theocratical kernel, but also of its conception and narration, are seen from the *theocratic-prophetic point of view*.

A specific *Israelitish-religious* and *theocratic character* is throughout more prominent in our Books than in the other historical books. RUETCHI rightly remarks (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, p. 213): "Careful recurrence to religious fundamental ideas is particularly important in the Books of Samuel, because they suppose in the reader a deep religious sense, and in this respect take, we may say, the highest rank among the historical books of the Old Testament." This character presupposes that view of the history of Israel as God's chosen people and possession (Ex. xix. 3-6), according to which this history is throughout determined by the specific-supernatural factor of divine control, and strives towards a highest divine goal, the realization of the rule and kingdom of God in the chosen people, and therefore is conditioned in its development not merely by human factors, but by supernatural divine guidance. The

aim of the history is to set before the people how the divine conception and purpose of a kingdom was fulfilled at the close of the period of the Judges in the establishment of the theocratic kingdom by its two first heads; or, how the controlling working of the God of Israel showed itself in the restoration of the Theocracy through Samuel's judicial-prophetic labors, and in the setting up of the theocratic kingdom under the contrast of its forever typical representatives, the rejected Anointed of the Lord and the true king after God's own heart. To this aim corresponds the tone of the *content* of the Books, which is essentially a history of the theocratic development of the kingdom of God in Israel during the period of the Judges, which closed with Samuel, and during that of the kingdom, which began with Saul and David. The composition and mode of presentation of the content is determined by this aim and by the turning-point of the whole history of Israel which lies in this development.

As in general the authors of the biblical-historical books do not fully and uniformly recount everything in the sacred history worthy of mention, but only give prominence to the most important elements of the history of the Kingdom of God in the facts and persons that exhibit them, grouping them according to their bearing on the history of the kingdom, so also the author of our Books does not design to give connected elaborate biographies of Samuel, Saul and David, but in the arrangement of the historical material makes a *selection* which is determined by the point of view of God's Kingdom in Israel, which develops itself by means of the divinely founded earthly-human kingdom into glorious power even over the heathen nations. Thus the chief momenta of the theocratic development of the history of Israel that lie in the time of transition from the Judges to the Kingdom, are grouped around Samuel, as the instrument of the divine working within and without, up to the end of 1 Sam. vii. Though Samuel continues to act a long time still as God's instrument, yet from ch. viii. the kingdom and the man chosen as its first head, Saul, appear in the foreground, till principially his theocratic mission as King of Israel ceases (end of ch. xiv.). True, from ch. xv. on to the close of 1 Sam. xxxi. the history of Saul and Israel is carried on; but the content and the form show plainly how the immediate divine interposition in Saul's inner and outer life is an advancing judgment, and essentially nothing but the divinely arranged consequence of the sentence of condemnation, xiii. 13, 14. The man whom the Lord had sought out "after his own heart, that he should at the Lord's command be captain over his people," appears in the very beginning of this retrogressive development of the history of Saul's kingdom as the theocratic centre of the whole following history, so that 1 Sam. xv.—2 Sam. xxiv. is from this point of view the history of David's kingdom. Appointed by immediate divine call and selection king of Israel, because in his relation to the Lord as the man after His heart he possesses the proper qualification for the position, he is saved by *divine* protection from Saul's persecutions and snares, under *divine* guidance and direction (2 Sam. ii. 1) assumes a partial royal authority at Hebron, and before *the Lord* makes a covenant with the elders of all Israel (ch. v.), in order then in Jerusalem to be confirmed by *the Lord* king over all the people (ver. 12). Since David recognizes and fulfils his theocratic calling to develop the victorious power of God's people against foes without, and to establish God's dominion and sanctify him within the people, as he shows by establishing the Ark on Mount Zion as the visible sign of both these aims, so the Lord acknowledges him in the great promise in 2 Sam. vii., that the Lord would establish the throne of his kingdom forever, and that the dominion of his house should last forever. David's deep fall does not invalidate this divine promise. The Lord indeed sends the punishment by word and deed (2 Sam. xii. 9-11) as necessary consequence of the grave sin of His Anointed. But David humbles himself in honest penitence under the mighty hand of God; the hand of the Lord leads him through all suffering in house and kingdom; the royal authority, shaken and sunken by his fault, is restored by God's controlling dealing with His servant; the divine promise preserves the historical supposition on which it is based, and remains in force. From the history of the last periods of his government the author brings out *one* other fundamental fact, namely, that human sin infallibly draws down divine punishment; but anger disappears before the divine mercy. By his thanksgiving song (ch. xxii.) and by his last prophetic utterance concerning

the righteous ruler over men, the ruler in the fear of God, the author presents David to us at the highest point of his theocratical kingship before the presence of the Lord. Here, therefore, is a real conclusion, which answers not to the *biographical*-historical, but to the *theocratical*-historical aim and content of the history. David is presented to us in this closing composite section as the servant of God, who has fulfilled his mission, whose house the Lord has built, and whose seed will build a house for the Lord as His dwelling-place in the midst of His royal people. The preliminary historical fulfillment of 2 Sam. vii., so far as it pertains to the time of David's government, has here in these last words of his found its conclusion. The narration of the weakness of his old age, of the historical occurrences occasioned by it, and of his death, all looking to Solomon's accession to the throne, could have no farther essential theocratic significance. The Book of Kings, however, makes these historical facts the introduction to the beginning of *Solomon's* reign, with which they stand in pragmatic connection, taking them from the sources common to him with the author of the Books of Samuel, and connects his narrative in 1 Kings i. 1 by the ו ["and"] with the historical work, the existence of which he assumes, and to which he refers in the very beginning (ii. 4 sq.) in connection with the promise in 2 Sam. vii. The omission of David's death therefore in the conclusion of this work is satisfactorily explained from the theocratic character and aim of the composition, since in this conclusion the fulfillment of the theocratical mission of David is completed.

But with this *theocratical* complexion of the history its *prophetical character* is inseparably connected. From the beginning of our Books on we see the great theocratic significance of the *Prophetic Order* in the history of the Kingdom of Israel, in the first place, as the organ of the divine Spirit and the medium of the divine guidance and control. Samuel appears here as the true founder of the Old Testament Prophetic Order as a permanent public power alongside of the priesthood and the kingly office. We see how, by the hand of God, the priesthood, which showed so badly in its representatives, together with the Ark, was removed from the centre of the theocratic development of history, and the Prophetic Order comes forward as mediating agency between God and His people, and, as Organ of the immediate application of the word and Spirit of God to the chosen people, calls forth a mighty movement of spiritual and religious-moral life. Over against the kingly office it is in part the theocratic *mediating office*, which, with controlling guidance, reveals to it God's counsel and will, and is thus a firm support of its power, in part the divine *watch-office*, which, in the name of the Lord, directs the fulfilling of the royal calling, punishes the king's sins, and is set to offer to royal tyranny a powerful opposition founded on the divine word. The stamp of the prophetic style appears not merely in particular prophecies (1 Sam. ii. 12; 2 Sam. vii. 12), but in the tone of the whole; a theocratic pragmatism everywhere ruling, by which is determined the selection of the material and the unfolding of the chief historical momenta.

Looked at in its particulars, the prophetic element in our Books appears in very varied form and relation. To the *song* with prophetical content at the beginning answers the prophetical *discourse* of the man of God, ii. 27-36, who announces to Eli and his family the approaching divine punishment. The first revelation which Samuel as "servant of the Lord" receives concerning the House of Eli, iii. 11-14, is the beginning of his prophetic office, and in vers. 19-21 it is briefly set forth in its significance and importance for the people as the accompaniment of his judicial office; and the words: "I will perform what I have spoken to Eli from beginning to end" (ver. 12) show "how this prophecy as the controlling divine working in the Theocracy forms for our historian the true kernel and centre of the whole history" (HAEVERN. *Einl.* II. 1, 125). The following history is the fulfillment of what God had announced by him as prophet, of the "words of God" by his mouth. As prophet he completes the reformation which is described in ch. vii.; by virtue of his prophetic calling he accomplishes the change of the theocratic constitution (viii., ix.), everywhere speaking and acting as immediate mouth-piece of God (x., xi.). His address to all Israel (ch. xii.) breathes the prophetic spirit with which he was filled. In his office of prophetic watchman he chides Saul's disobedience, and foretells to him the downfall of his kingdom, xiii. (comp. xii. 25). The narrative of the battle and victory over the Philistines, xiii. 6—xiv. 46, rep-

resents the brilliant success of Israel under Jonathan as an exhibition of the Lord's power for his people (xiv. 10, 12, 15, 23, 45): "So the Lord saved Israel that day, the Lord wrought it through Jonathan." In chs. xv., xvi., Samuel displays all the power which he had over against Saul by virtue of his prophetical office, announcing to him by divine direction the sentence of rejection on account of his disobedience, and anointing David to be king in his stead. The Lord speaks to Samuel, and Samuel speaks in the name of the Lord as his prophet to Saul; xv. 1, 10 sq., 16 sq., 22 sq., 26 sq.; xvi. 1 sq., 7 sq. Saul had been made a partaker of the prophetical spirit. Now the Spirit of Jehovah leaves him. "And the Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward" (xvi. 13, 14). "The Lord was with him, and was departed from Saul" (xviii. 12). This is the consequence of God's immediate interference by the word and deed of the prophet. This is, as it were, the prophetic superscription to all that is related from ch. xvii. to the end of the First Book concerning Saul's demeanor towards David and the relation between them, and concerning the ever-deepening condemnation into which Saul was falling, and the repeated indication and certification of David as the Anointed of the Lord. The whole varied content of this large section is not a portraiture of David's private life from a biographical point of view, as HAEVERNICK maintains (p. 127), but a description, from a *prophetical* point of view, and going into biographical details, of the history of David as the king chosen and anointed in Saul's stead, who is persecuted by Saul because *he* is the Anointed of the Lord, and whom God protects against Saul because *he* has received the mission and promise of the kingdom. All this is clearly understood only when it is looked at from the theocratic-prophetic point of view which controls the whole account; it is all, as HAEVERNICK (*ubi sup.*) rightly says, the development of ch. xvi., the consequence of the desertion of Saul by the Spirit of Jehovah, but at the same time for that very reason to be regarded as narrated from a purely prophetical stand-point, which is clearly indicated in xiii. 25 and xvi. 13, 14. This, however, HAEVERNICK fails to see; he establishes the prophetic element simply from the presence of prophetic *utterances*, and so thinks it has as good as disappeared here, because he without ground assumes that the preceding narration (up to ch. xvi.) was taken from a document which was a collection of prophetic words of Samuel.

But we have to recognize the prophetical element in this second larger half of the First Book not merely on account of those all-controlling prophetical *points of view* under which lie these histories with their divine factor, which has a double operation in respect to Saul and David; it manifests itself also in *individual passages* immediately in the appearance and actions of *prophetic persons* and in *occurrences* which put in the clearest light the importance of the prophetic office in the connection of these narratives. In the first place, the section xix. 18-24 has more importance than HAEVERNICK (p. 127) accords to it. David's flight to Samuel to Ramah, the statements which he makes to him of Saul's conduct towards himself, his long stay with Samuel and in the school of the Prophets there, whither Saul comes to seek him out—all this supposes that he had already before been intimately associated with Samuel, especially (it is probable) since the anointing (xvi. 13), and had had the advantage of his counsel and direction for his future calling. There with Samuel David seeks safety; there in the circle of prophet-pupils he finds repose, collectedness, strengthening for his inner life. We here get a view of the associated life and the holy usages of the prophet-school at Ramah, in which the prophetic inspiration is so mighty that Saul's messengers and he himself are seized by it. Samuel appears at the head of this community of prophets, whence came the watchmen of the Theocracy; "this is a clear sign that his labors in the latter part of his life were directed especially to this department of effort," as NAEGELSBACH rightly remarks (*ubi sup.*, p. 398). Again, we see the prophetic influence on the history of David in the person of the prophet Gad (xxii. 5), from which we may infer the close union in which David constantly stood during his persecution with the prophetic circle and with Samuel, whether it be that Gad, ever since his abode in Ramah, was more intimately connected with him, and shared his wandering life, or that he was sent to him by Samuel as deputy to tell him of the danger attending his stay in Ramah (which was well known there), and counsel him to pass over into the territory of the Tribe of Judah. The brief notice (xxv. 1) of

Samuel's death has by no means the mere significance of an external passing mention, but is a weighty testimony to the great authority which Samuel had wielded in the whole nation till his death, and to the permanent mighty influence which he had exerted as Reformer of the Theocracy, and so even after he had laid down his official judicial position, as Chief Leader of God's people and as Prophet.

The Second Book shows us in the history of David, besides the universally controlling *theocratic* point of view—as, for example, in the account of his entrance on the rule over Judah (ii. 1 sq.), his growth in power and recognition (iii. 1 sq.), and his covenant with all the Tribes of Israel (v. 1 sq.)—in important crises the mighty and decisive *influence of the Prophetic Order*, over against which here, as in the First Book, the Priesthood retires into the background. From ch. vii., which has a specifically marked prophetic coloring, a clear light is thrown back on the history in chs. i.–vi. by the words in ver. 1; because David under divine guidance had obtained the whole royal authority and sat in a strong royal seat, and by God's might had cast down his enemies round about, he receives through the prophet Nathan this divine promise of the imperishableness of the rule of his House and of the building of the Lord's house. From this prophetic passage clear light falls also on all that follows: the wars with external enemies end, in accordance with this promise and prophecy, with splendid victories, and must conduce to the highest development of the royal power and the establishment of the royal Theocracy (chs. viii.–x.). The internal shocks given to the royal authority by David's sin and the crimes of individual members of his House cannot defeat the fulfilment of the promise given to this house; the prophetic watch-office fulfils through Nathan its duty towards the deep-sunken king as preacher of repentance, but announces also to the penitent king the pardon of his sin, without keeping back the judgments, announced by God, which would fall on his house; they are completed according to the prophetic announcement, till the Lord restores the kingdom in its power, while the scion of the House, with whom David's House proper was to begin, to whom the royal authority is promised forever, stands under the protection and guidance of the same prophet (xi.–xx.). The prophetic content of the closing section (xxi.–xxiv.) has already been set forth; David himself here appears as prophet in the latter part of his reign, and the prophetic office again fulfils through the prophet Gad a divine mission for king and people. And if we look at the significance of the description of the prophet Gad as "David's Seer," and at the intimate and lasting personal relations in which we have found David to stand with Samuel and Nathan, it is not to be doubted that God's immediate guidance of his life through word and deed connected itself with these three conspicuous prophetic personages, whom we here encounter in his history.

The significance of the prophetic element, inseparably connected with the theocratic, is therefore great enough in the content of our Books to establish two things: 1) that the composition of these Books is throughout controlled by the theocratic prophetic point of view, and that the content has a corresponding coloring, and 2) that this content, a great part of it at least, was taken from a tradition whose centre and starting-point was in the mighty and influential Prophetic Order.

Our investigation has thus led us to the question concerning the origin and genesis of the Books of Samuel, for the answer to which, so far as it is possible, we have gained the necessary foundation in the examination of the content and character of the Books. We must here come to a decision respecting the *sources*, the *author*, and the *time* of composition, in order to explain approximately the historical origin of the work.

[The *Messianic* character of "Samuel" is one of its most marked features. The central figure of the book, David, is also the central figure of Messianic prophecy, the man who, most of all Old Testament-personages, in his life, experiences, and character, sums up the life of the servants of God, and thus represents the great Head of them all. It is in this Book that the three elements of the Jewish state, the prophetic, priestly, and kingly offices are first fully established, and not only fix the development of the typical Israel, but set forth the functions of the Anointed Leader of the true Israel. This feature of the Book is connected immediately with its theocratic-prophetical character, and gives to the latter its full

significance. It is because the kingdom of Israel is preparatory to another, and David the forerunner of his greater Son that this history is of transcendent importance. And, as the general principles of God's dealings with His servants are the same from age to age, we may see in this history of the fortunes of Israel and its leaders an anticipation of the history of the later Dispensation, distinctly marked in proportion to the theocratic prominence of the persons and events. The proclamation of David as king has its counterpart in the announcement of the setting up of the Divine Son (Acts xiii. 33); David's conviction of the preserving love of God towards His servants is fulfilled in the resurrection of Christ (Acts xiii. 34-37); and David's purpose to build a house for the Lord is the occasion of the promise of an everlasting seed (2 Sam. vii. 13), and this covenant points him to the Righteous Ruler (2 Sam. xxiii. 1-7) as the consummation of his hopes. Thus the whole Book is an anticipation on a lower platform, and with imperfect material, of the true spiritual kingdom of Christ. *Bible Commentary*, Introd. to "Samuel": "the very title, 'the Christ,' given to the Lord Jesus (in Matt. i. 16 and elsewhere) is first found in 1 Sam. ii. 10; and the other designation of the Saviour as the 'Son of David' is also derived from 2 Sam. vii. 12-16." WORDSWORTH, Introd. to "Samuel": "The book of Samuel occupies an unique place, and has a special value and interest, as revealing the kingdom of Christ. It is the first book in Holy Scripture which declares the Incarnation of Christ as King—in a particular family—the family of David. It is the first book in Scripture which announced that the Kingdom founded in Him, raised up from the seed of David, would be universal and everlasting. Here also the prophetic song of Hannah gives the clue to the interpretation of this history." "An uninspired Annalist could hardly have treated the history of Samuel, Saul and David, in such a manner as to display preparatory and prophetic foreshadowings of the office and Work of Christ as Prophet, Priest and King, and of the history of Judaism in relation to Him."—But while this history of God's kingdom in its early earthly investiture is thus truly a foreshadowing, a historical typical prophecy of the antitypical spiritual kingdom of Christ, we must guard against an arbitrary typical interpretation of individual facts (in which WORDSWORTH in his Commentary often offends). A historical fact that sustains a clearly defined and important relation to the theocratic kingdom, expressing in itself a fundamental spiritual truth, may be the type of some other historical fact in the New Dispensation that expresses the same spiritual truth. Otherwise the distinction between type and illustration must be carefully maintained. On this general subject FAIRBAIRN'S "*Typology*," and his "*Prophecy*," and R. P. SMITH'S "*Prophecy a Preparation for Christ*" may be advantageously consulted.—TR.].

§ 5. THE SOURCES.

As to the *sources* of our Books, in the first place, it is generally admitted that their content has been taken *from various sources;* but in the determination of these sources opinions differ widely. We shall first develop our view on the basis of the results reached in the preceding section, adopting, however, at the outset, the excellent canon for this investigation which BLEEK has laid down. He says (*Einl.* p. 366): "*We may assume with tolerable certainty that the author of these books, besides the poetical passages which he has introduced, in some parts found and used written memorials of the times and events of which he treats; but it is impossible to determine throughout with any certainty or with particular probability* (as several modern scholars had attempted to do, see DE WETTE, § 179) *how many earlier writings the author uses, or precisely what he has taken from one or the other.*"

The position and importance of the *prophetical* element of the Books makes it beforehand very probable that the author took a corresponding portion of his matter from written traditions of *prophetical origin.* The development and influence of the Prophetic Order through and under Samuel, especially in the community of the "sons of the prophets," which was under his direction, coincides with the beginning of the extensive literary activity, the object of which was *the history of Israel in the light of the Theocracy.* In the hands of Prophecy lay the theocratic writing of history, in which this history was described, in its outward progress and according to its internal connection of cause and effect, not as a mere result of human

factors, but rather according to the all-controlling *divine* factor, and in the light of God's guidance by His holy will and His retributive righteousness, that is, according to *theocratic* pragmatism, *in order* that in this mirror the revelations of the living and holy God and their experiences and fortunes, which had their root in the divine righteousness, might be set before the people for warning, for threatening, and for consolation. This was clearly the case in the most flourishing period of the Prophetic Order, which coincides with the time of the kings, for almost all the books which "Chronicles" cites for the history of Israel from David to Hezekiah are called prophetical histories. Though it may be doubtful in particular instances, considered apart from the rest, whether the name of the prophet indicates the author or the chief personage of the history, for example "the words" of Nathan the prophet, yet in general the first is by far the more probable, as appears especially from the titles Nebuath Ahijah [Prophecy of A.], Chazoth Jedai [vision of J.], Chazon Isaiah, and from 2 Chron. xxvi. 22, where Isaiah is expressly said to be the author of a history of Uzziah (Bleek, p. 158 sq.). According to the testimony of the Chronicler the three authorities on which the author of the Books of Kings bases his history, "the Book of the Acts of Solomon, the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel, and the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah" (1 Kings xi. 41; xiv. 19, 29), were collections from prophetical historical books, whose authors lived at the same time with or after the events which they related. The author of the Books of Kings, in the history of Solomon (in which several sections are identical with the account in "Chronicles," so that the two are taken from the same source) refers to "the Book of the Acts of Solomon," while "Chronicles" instead of this refers to the "words" (דִּבְרֵי) of the prophet Nathan, the "prophecy" (נְבוּאַת) of the prophet Ahijah of Shiloh, and the "vision" (חֲזוֹת) of the seer Iddo (2 Chr. ix. 29). Where the first for the history of the Kings, from Rehoboam on, cites the Book of the Kings of Judah, the other cites "the words (דִּבְרֵי) of the prophet Shemaiah and of the seer Iddo" (Rehoboam, 2 Chr. xii. 15), the "מִדְרַשׁ (midrash or commentary) of the prophet Iddo" (Abijah, xiii. 22), "the writing (כָּתַב) of the prophet Isaiah". (Uzziah, xxvi. 22), "the words (דִּבְרֵי) of the seers" (Manasseh, xxiii. 18, 19), "the words (דִּבְרֵי) of Jehu, the son of Hanani," "which are recorded in the Book of the Kings of Israel" (Jehoshaphat, xx. 34), the vision (חָזוֹן) of Isaiah (Hezekiah, xxxii. 32).

Now in the Books of Samuel we do not find any such references to earlier historical writings as basis of the history, as in the Books of Kings and Chronicles; but it does not thence follow that the Redactor did not use such authorities, inasmuch as there was no need to cite them. If the prophetical historiography occupies so important a place in the history of Solomon and the succeeding kings, we may thence, looking back, surmise that there were similar sources for the history of David, who, as has been shown, was so intimately connected with the communities of prophets. In respect to the non-mention of such sources it is to be remarked that the farther the authors of the Books of Kings and Chronicles stood from the times of which they wrote, the more requisite they would feel it to make express mention of their authorities, which, like the events, were on account of the distance not well known to their readers, while it would not seem necessary to an author who lived comparatively near to the events which he described, (as was the case with the author of our Books, on which see below), to name to his readers authorities known to them, and thus to commend the credibility of his history (see Haevern., p. 148; Then., p. XIV.). But on the other hand, as our author was not near enough to the time embraced in his history to describe the events of this period as one who had *taken part* in them, he was not in position to give so distinct and detailed an account as we have, unless he had access to very full written authorities besides the *oral* tradition to which, in oriental histories, so much value is to be attached.

We have already seen that large parts of the history of David, and precisely those which go most into particulars about persons and facts, point to the school of the Prophets in Ramah; 1 Sam. xix., xx., xxii., xxv., xxviii. In 1 Sam. xix. 18, in the statement that David "at Ramah told all that Saul had done to him," we have good ground for the assumption

that in this community of prophets was noted down immediately, from David's statements and the accounts of his companions, what could not be written from their own observation and experience. Compare THENIUS' remarks on chap. xx., p. 90, and chap. xv., p. 114,—especially on chap. xix., p. 89: "David's stay in the Seminary of the prophets guarantees the historical character especially of what our Book so particularly recounts, in this chapter and some of the following, of David's relation to Jonathan and Saul, it being very probable that *there* David's own accounts were noted down, and that the reports here given are based, in part at least, on those notes." It is evident also from 1 Sam. x. 5 sq., that there was a school of the prophets at Gibeah, Saul's dwelling-place, not far from Samuel's abode, and we may therefore suppose that here too, as in Ramah and other prophetic communities, theocratic historiography was cultivated, and that here we may look for a principal authority in Saul's history. We shall not err if we suppose that, apart from the sections in which accounts are given of prophetic agency in the time of Saul and David (Samuel's, Nathan's, Gad's), all the narrations also in which mention is made of the direct influence of the word of the Lord on the history (for example, in Saul's history, 1 Sam. xiv. 18 sq., and in David's history, 1 Sam. xxiii. 1 sq.; xxx. 7 sq ; 2 Sam. ii. 1 sq.; v. 1 sq.; v. 18-25) are to be referred to prophetic-historical records as the primary source.

If, now, we ask for express mention of such historical writings of prophetical origin and character as, according to the preceding discussion, we are warranted in assuming or presupposing as the basis of our Books, we shall not find it in 1 Sam. x. 25, where it is said of Samuel "that he told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book, and laid it up before the Lord." The content of this book is not stated; for it cannot have been the "manner (law) of the king," viii. 11-17; but it no doubt contained the conditions fixed by Samuel, by which a barrier was set up against undue extension of the royal power, and the duties and rights of the king were fixed after the norm of God's will. From the existence of this writing of Samuel, which did not come into general circulation, but, with the fundamental law of the Theocracy, the Torah [Law], was deposited in the Sanctuary of God, we may infer that he himself, like the prophetic communities, of which he was the founder and leader, occupied himself with literary pursuits, and particularly it seems certain that he wrote down his prophetical declarations and discourses, as we have them in the first book, and the same thing may be assumed of Nathan in reference to 2 Sam. vii., xii., and of Gad in reference to 1 Sam. xxii. 5, and 2 Sam. xxiv. 11-14. Recollecting, then, the flourishing condition of prophetical historical writing, according to the citations of the Chronicles, even in the beginning of the regal period, it is to these three prophets that we must look to find the foundation of this history.

The prophetical authorities, not mentioned in our Books, from which the history is taken, are found in fact in 1 Chr. xxix. 29, 30: "*And the history* (דִּבְרֵי) *of king David, the first and the last, behold, it is written in the history* (דִּבְרֵי) *of Samuel the seer, and in the history of Nathan the prophet, and in the history of Gad the Seer,* with all his reign and his might, and the times that went over him and over Israel, and over all the kingdoms of the countries." With these words the Chronicler closes his *narrative of the history of David* (chs. x.—xxix.), which agrees with the history in "Samuel" not only in general but also in particulars often literally. He refers for the history of David to three productions: the דִּבְרֵי שְׁמוּאֵל הָרֹאֶה [Words of Samuel the seer], the דִּבְרֵי נָתָן הַנָּבִיא [Words of Nathan the Prophet] and the דִּבְרֵי גָד הַחֹזֶה [Words of Gad the Seer], and characterizes them at the same time as works valuable for their fulness, and furnishing material complete as to the time embraced, and elaborate and exact in content. Evidently the Chronicler purposes giving the sources from whence he takes his history, and establishing its credibility and trustworthiness. It is plain, from this purpose of his, which relates to the *facts* recounted by him, and from the *content* of the list of authorities, that the דִּבְרֵי [words] means not merely declarations, discourses of the prophets (HAEVERN., KEIL), but also *history* or *narrations;* it remains undecided at the outset whether the names of the prophets indicate the authors or the chief personages. In any case these titles point to *independent writings*, and by no means to mere extracts from a great work entitled

"the chronicles of the kings of Judah and Israel," as BERTHEAU supposes (*Bücher der Chronik*, 1854, *Einl.* § 8). Nor is the view tenable that our Books of Samuel themselves in their corresponding divisions are meant by that citation under three names (CARPZOV, *Introd.* II.; J. D. MICHAELIS on 1 Chr. xxix. 29; EICHHORN II., p. 487 sq.; MOVERS on Chr., p. 178, and DE WETTE, *Einl.* [*Introd.*] § 192 *b*); for that the three names in the citation are to be understood as the titles of three different independent productions follows, not only from the form of the citation, but also from the fact that "the Dibre of Nathan the prophet" is again specially adduced for the history of *Solomon* (2 Chr. ix. 29); and we cannot suppose this to be a different work (as DE WETTE does, *ubi sup.*), and therefore it is not an extract from our Books of Samuel, which extend only to the latter part of David's government (comp. BLEEK, *Einl.* p. 151; HAEVERNICK, p. 122 sq.; THEN. XVI.; KEIL, *Apolog. Vers. über die Chron.*, 249 sq.).

If now we further compare the content of the Books of Chronicles in reference to David's life with our Books, we find *first*, that the Chronicler, who adduces those three works as a complete authority for David's life, narrates much that is not found in our Books, especially many things referring to worship, priests, and Levites; he alone gives the list of heroes who came to David to Ziklag, and of warriors who made him king in Hebron (1 Chr. xii.), the detail of David's preparations for the building of the Temple (xxii.), the numbering and organization of the Levites and priests (xxiii.—xxvi.), the organization of the army and the civil service (xxvii.), the report of his last arrangements in the assembly of the people shortly before his death. *Secondly*, our Books contain much that is lacking in the Books of the Chronicles, for example, the history of Michal and David (2 Sam. vi. 20-23), the account of David's kindness towards Mephibosheth (2 Sam. ix.), of his adultery with Bathsheba (xi.), of Nathan's exhortation to repentance and its results (xii.), the section narrating the incest, the distraction of David's house and Absalom's revolt (xiv.—xix.), the insurrection of Sheba (xx.), the atonement in the case of the Gibeonites (xxi.), the war with the Philistines (xxi. 15-17), the Thanksgiving-Psalm and the last words of David (xxii., xxiii. 1-7).—On the other hand, *thirdly*, the following is a summary statement of the parallel sections:

1 Chron.	x. 1–12.	:	1 Sam.	xxxi.
"	xi. 1–9.	:	2 Sam.	v. 1–3, 6–10.
"	xi. 10–47.	:	"	xxiii. 8–39.
"	xiii. 1–14.	:	"	vi. 1–11.
"	xiv. 1–7, 8–17.	:	"	v. 11–16, 17–25.
"	xv., xvi.	:	"	vi. 12–23.
"	xvii.	:	"	vii.
"	xviii.	:	"	viii.
"	xix.	:	"	x.
"	xx. 1–3.	:	"	xi. 1; xii. 26–31.
"	xx. 4–8.	:	"	xxi. 18–22.
"	xxi.	:	"	xxiv.

In these parallel sections, as KEIL exhaustively remarks, "not only are the short summary accounts of the Books of Samuel largely filled out and extended, but the narration of Chronicles differs from the older narration of those Books in many ways, partly by a different orthography and various linguistic changes mostly according to the style and usage of later times, sometimes merely to make an expression clearer, partly by the omission of accessory circumstances, and by other abridgements, partly by the addition of explanatory remarks, and parenetic and pragmatic reflections and concluding observations" (*Introd.* II. 55).—Such being the relation between the Books of Chronicles and Samuel, it is an untenable view that the latter are *identical* with the authorities cited by the former on the government of David, and that, as GRAF maintains (*Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, Leipz. 1866) "*sections* of our Books of Samuel are meant by the words of Samuel the Seer, and of Nathan the Prophet, and of Gad the Seer."

For the same reason we cannot accept what BLEEK (*Einl.*, p. 151 [Eng. Tr., p. 406])

thinks very probable, "that the Chronicler intended our Books of Samuel by the first-named work, the Dibre Samuel."

The peculiar relation of the generally literal agreement of Chronicles and our Books in the parallel sections, and the differences which exist in the history of David, both within and without these sections, is incompatible with the view that the Books of Samuel were used as an authority by the Chronicler in these sections; rather it follows from this co-existing agreement and diversity in the history of David that the authors of both works draw from a common source, namely, from that which the Chronicler expressly names as his authority, in order to establish the trustworthiness of his narrative from the acknowledged high antiquity and authenticity of its basis. If in fact, as is generally acknowledged, the Chronicler used our Books no more than the Book of Kings for the history of David, but, to judge from the relation of the two Books, used a common source with our author, and expressly names those writings as his authority, then there can be no doubt that the latter were used by our author as his authority; and this in no wise detracts from the credibility of his history, for there could be no more trustworthy accounts of the life of David than those contained in these writings, which bear the name of the three prophets so intimately connected with him, and are based finally on their own experiences, and on what might be learned from him with exactness of his life in those prophetic communities with which he stood in such intimate union. Certainly the "foundation of the work" was taken from this source (DELITZSCH, *Zeitschr. f. luth. Theol. u. Krit.*, 1870, 1, p. 29 sq.). From these prophetic writings comes the theocratic-prophetic element of our Books; and we shall have to refer to them also the predominatingly biographical and political matter, which, as we have seen, is treated from the theocratic-prophetic point of view; for the events of David's life, from his own communications and from their connection with him, must have been best known to the prophetic circles, and especially to Samuel (1 Sam. xix. 18), Gad (1 Sam. xxii. 5), and Nathan (2 Sam. vii.). Whether, now, we suppose that those three prophetic works were composed by the prophets whose names they bear—in favor of which is Samuel's known addiction to literary pursuits, 1 Sam. x. 25, (NAEGELSBACH suggests (*ubi sup.*, p. 398) that he perhaps wrote down these records during his quiet prophetic life at Ramah), and the fact that the history of Solomon, 2 Chr. ix. 29, is referred to the account of Nathan himself—or whether we regard them as works of which the sayings and doings of those prophets formed the chief part, in either case they must be regarded as the triple source of prophetic historiography for our Books, in either case, considering the great importance of those three prophets in the development of this history, and the permanent personal relation in which they, especially Samuel and Nathan, stood to David, these sources were so abundant, that, with the exception of a few portions, the content of our Books may be referred to them. How they individually correspond to sections, or how far they extend in the different divisions of our work, cannot (according to the above-cited canon of BLEEK) be determined with certainty. Yet the following may be stated as probable. We may take the "Dibre" of Samuel as chief authority not merely for the narrative of David's life, but also for Saul's life and the life and work of Samuel; for, says KEIL rightly (*Introd.* I., 249), if they "contained such full accounts of David's public life that the Chronicler could cite them as authority for it, it is self-evident that the same work was the chief source for the life and labors of Samuel and Saul also." If Samuel himself was the author of them, we can refer to them only the First Book to about ch. xxv. If they are a prophetic history, with him as principal subject, and extended beyond his death to the results of his labors in the accession and early government of David, then they form the basis of part of the Second Book also. In any case to this source belongs all that relates to Samuel's labors, and what in the life of David as well as Saul is pragmatically connected therewith. To the Dibre of Nathan belongs of course all that is related of Nathan and his work in the history of David in the Second Book as far as ch. xii., and, very probably, in part at least what stands in theocratic connection with it (xiii.—xx. comp. with xii. 11). Probably xxiv. 11-25 belonged to the Dibre of Gad, of which we also find a trace perhaps in 1 Sam. xxii. 5. If each of these three prophets is the *author* of the work called after him, his own experiences formed the chief part of his book. THEODORET: δῆλον τοίνυν,

ὡς τῶν προφητῶν ἕκαστος συνέγραψε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις πεπραγμένα καιροῖς ["it is evident that every prophet recorded the events of his own times"].

Proceeding now further in the investigation of the historical sources of our Books, we find not improbably a trace of *a written basis for them besides those already named*, in the דִּבְרֵי הַיָּמִים לַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִיד, "*the chronicles* [history of the times] *of King David.*" We know nothing more of this than what is said in 1 Chr. xxvii. 24 in connection with the account of the numbering of the people by David. "Joab," we read, "had begun to number, but did not finish; and there fell wrath for it upon Israel, and the number was not put into the 'account' (De Wette) or 'census' of the chronicles (annals) of King David." According to this, it was a historical work relating to the government of David, and, as it seems, chiefly of statistical-historical content and character, since, in the midst of statistical-historical lists relating to the divisions of the army, the tribe-princes and civil officials, it is cited as a work into whose מִסְפַּר [number or census] the מִסְפָּר [number] of the arms-bearing men of the tribes of Israel was not put, whence we may infer that the preceding enumeration is taken from it. While the history of this census (comp. 1 Chr. xxi.), narrated from a theocratic-prophetic stand-point, was doubtless contained in the corresponding prophetical work (Gad's according to 2 Sam. xxiv. 11), the number of arms-bearing men is here declared to be something that would have been inserted in the enumeration or register of the chronicles of David, if the census had not been interrupted by the wrath of God. Thus is intimated the point of view which prevented the recording of the number, as far as it was already determined; it is the *theocratic-prophetic.* This might suggest the supposition that such chiefly annalistic-statistical historical works, giving information concerning the army and the civil government, heroes and officials, household and family, were prepared by prophetical writers or under the guidance of prophets; and we might therefore here also in the "chronicles of David" recognize a *prophetical* work. But even supposing that the prophetical historiography never occupied itself either indirectly or directly with such annalistic-statistical records, it could nevertheless use them as trustworthy sources. It is highly probable that the officer termed סוֹפֵר *Sopher* (Chancellor or Secretary of State) had the care of these annalistic-statistical records whence came the דִּבְרֵי הַיָּמִים [chronicles] of David. The widespread opinion that the officer at David's court who was called מַזְכִּיר, *Mazkir* or Recorder (2 Sam. viii. 16, and xx. 24; 1 Chr. xviii. 15) was the official state-annalist, and had to perform the duty of a historiographer has been conclusively shown to be untenable by Bleek (*Einl.* p. 158, 370) and Baehr (*Komm. z. d. Büchern d. Könige, Einl.* X. sq.). The elaborate pragmatic writing of history was in the hands of the prophets. The *Mazkir* (according to Thenius on 1 Kings iv. 3) was so called "because as *μνήμων* he had to bring to the king's recollection affairs of state which were to be attended to, and offer counsel," and "if it was his duty, as Bleek says (*ubi sup.* p. 370), always to write down immediately whatever of special importance happened, this was merely to remind the king his master, and not to write history."—"The supposition by most critics of state-annals, besides the prophetic records, as a second authority is based on an arbitrary confounding of the records of the Chancellor for the state-archives with public state-annals." (Keil, *Introd.* § 54, *Rem.* 3; comp. § 59). The work mentioned in 1 Chr. xxviii. 24, the דִּבְרֵי י׳ ד׳ [chronicles of David] was, however, very probably a collection of such official *annalistic-statistic-historical* records of the *Sopherim.* It is a natural supposition that the lists of officials in 2 Sam. viii. 15-18 and xx. 23-26 belongs to this work, although on the other hand we may presume that their names were known to the prophetical historiographers also. Yet it is true that the latter could have had little to do with the statistics of the specifically military affairs and the deeds of war, which they described only so far as seemed to them necessary from the theocratic point of view. So it is probable that the statistical-historical account of the wars of David in 2 Sam. viii. belonged to this work, while the therein-mentioned Ammonite–Syrian war is afterwards narrated at length, in connection with the sin of David and the intervention of Nathan, according to the prophetical work. So also the summary statement of the Philistine wars in 2 Sam. xxi. 15–22 and the register of heroes in xxiii. 8–39.

Perhaps the author of our Books had access to other historical records, to which might be referred such sections as 1 Sam. xvii. 12–31, 55 sq., which do not seem to agree with the

context. Yet this can no more be determined with certainty than the question whether and how far oral tradition was used by the author, from which the incongruences in the passages in question might be explained. It is however possible, as NAEGELSBACH supposes (*ubi sup.* p. 140), that the prophetical books discussed above contained many different accounts (from which that incongruity in 1 Sam. xvii. 12, 55 sq., may be explained), or no longer existed in proper arrangement and clearness.

Besides the historical authorities the Redactor of our Books was acquainted with *poetical* productions which he has inserted in his history: as, the Song of Hannah, 1 Sam. ii. 1–10; David's lament over Abner, 2 Sam. iii. 33, 34; David's song of praise, 2 Sam. xxii.; and his last words, 2 Sam. xxiii. 1-7. We leave it undecided whether these songs were known to him separately, or belonged in part to a collection of songs—as BLEEK says of the last words of David, supposing that they with their superscription (xxiii. 1) belonged to a *mashal*-collection (*ubi sup.* p. 362, 363)—or were all found in one poetical collection. The only authority to which he expressly refers is the *Sepher Hajjashar*, Book of Jashar (2 Sam. i. 18; comp. Josh. x. 13). From this he took the beautiful lamentation of David over Saul and Jonathan, which is inserted in the narrative under the title "Bow" קָשֶׁת, vers. 19-27. This "Book of the Just" (*i. e.*, "of that which is just") (in this collective sense it is now usually explained, Vulgate: *liber justorum*) must have contained a collection of songs on specially memorable events of Israelitish history, and must have been in existence at the time of the composition of the present Book of Joshua and of the Books of Samuel. We cannot determine whether it contained also a continuous *history* of the events to which the songs refer, and was therefore an authority for the author of our Books (see BLEEK, p. 150). According to KNOBEL (*Komm. zum Pent., Schlussabhandlung, Exeget. Handbuch* 13, p. 546 sq., and on Josh. x. 15) it was a "law-book," a view which falls to the ground with the untenable view that the title means law-book.

The sources, therefore, from which the author drew, were partly *prophetical* histories, which described the lives of Samuel, Saul and David, from the theocratic-prophetical standpoint in pragmatic connection (comp. 1 Chr. xxix. 28–30), partly official *statistical-historical records* of the history of David's government (comp. 1 Chr. xxvii. 24), partly *poetical* literature. *To this threefold element of the sources of the Books the content of the concluding section, 2 Sam. xxi.—xxiv., clearly points.* The production of these authorities is to be put partly in the time, partly soon after the time of the events to which they refer. On the ground of these contemporaneous original accounts our Books bear throughout the stamp of historical credibility; so THENIUS (*Einl.* XV.), who, it is true, grants this of a part of the work only, otherwise admirably remarks: "1) the places and very often the time also of the events are given in part with great exactness; 2) the narrative answers fully to the character of the times; and 3) the personages act in a life-like way."

In this section on the original authorities we must mention the principal of the very various and often contradictory hypotheses concerning the basis and construction of our Books, all of which are founded on their supposed contradictions, incongruences and repetitions, and therefore fall with this untenable presupposition.

The first hypothesis worthy of mention is that of EICHHORN (*Einl.* III., §§ 469, 471, 475). According to it the foundation of the Second Book of Samuel is an "old short life of David with later insertions," which, however, are also to be referred to written sources, while the First Book was taken from an "old chronicle of Samuel and Saul," but contained also elements of oral tradition, especially in Samuel's history. The Books received their present form from insertions and additions which were made from oral tradition and writings.—This hypothesis is so far modified by BERTHOLDT (*Einl.*, p. 894 sq., 920 sq.) that he assumes four principal authorities: 1) for 1 Sam. xxxi. and 2 Sam. v., with EICHHORN the summary history of David's government with later insertions and additions; 2) for 1 Sam. i.—vii. a history of Samuel, for viii.—xvi. a history of Saul, for xvii.—xxx. a history of David before his accession to the throne.—Further by an *anonymous* writer (in PAULUS *Memor.* VIII. 61 sq. *Probe eines Krit. Vers. über das zweite Buch Sam.*) many smaller component parts were assumed for the Second Book on the ground of supposed stylistic differences (thus 1 Sam. xxxi.;

2 Sam. i. 1–16, 17–28; iv., v. 1–10; xi.—xvi.).—STAEHELIN (*Krit. Unters. üb. d. Pent.*, p. 112 sq., 129 sq.) assumes as basis of the First Book an old work which he ascribes to the Jehovist, to which important additions were made by the Redactor, from whom also the whole of the Second Book comes.—GRAMBERG (*Gesch. d. Religionsideen d. Alt. Test.* II., p. 71 sq.) finds two narrations, going over nearly the same ground, but contradictory, which went side by side through a great part of the First Book and into the Second, and were worked up together by the collector.—GRAF (*De librorum Sam. et Reg. compositione, scriptoribus, etc.*, Argent. 1842) assumes as old constituent parts 1 Sam. xiii. 16—xiv. 52; xvii.; xviii.; xix. 1–17; xx.—xxii.; xxiii.—xxvi.; xxvii.; xxviii. 1 f.; xxix.; xxx. All the rest he holds to be marvel-loving hierarchical addition—that Samuel is presented as an ideal of theocratic prophetic rule—that the judgeship of Samuel and Eli is an invention, and Saul's election a product of his name "he who is demanded"—and that in the same way older portions and later additions in the Second Book were distinguished. On all these hypotheses see DE WETTE, § 179, who points out what is more or less unfounded in them, and says of the last: "This criticism is based almost entirely on what seemed to the author historically credible or not."—On GRAMBERG'S hypothesis see HAEVERNICK (p. 141) and THENIUS (p. XI.). The latter properly characterizes it in the remark that "sections of wholly different character are arbitrarily thrown together, and precisely those sections in which the presence of tradition cannot be mistaken, are declared to be the *older*."

What THENIUS says of the above-cited attempts to fix the component parts of the Books of Samuel—that they are all open to unanswerable objections—applies to his own hypothesis also. He distinguishes on internal grounds five principal parts: 1) a *history of Samuel*, 1 Sam. i.—vii., based on information gotten from the schools of the Prophets and on trustworthy tradition; 2) a history of Saul according to *tradition*, probably introduced from a popular work, viii.; x. 17–27; xi.; xii.; xv.; xvi.; xviii. 6–14; xxvi.; xxviii. 3–25; xxxi.; 3) an older *condensed history of Saul* from old *written* accounts, and not altered in its historical foundation by tradition, ix.; x. 1-26; xiii.; xiv.; 4) a *history of David*, into which the condensed history of Saul has been enlarged by a not much later continuer, xiv. 52; xvii.; part of xviii.; xix.; xx.; part of xxi.; xxii.; part of xxiii.; xxiv.; xxv.; xxvii.; xxviii. 1, 2; xxix.; xxx.; 2 Sam., part of chaps. i.–v.; vii.; viii.; 5) a *special history of David*, almost a biography, describing the second half of his life, and especially his domestic life, 2 Sam. xi. 2-27; xii. 1-25; xiii.—xx. The objections to this attempt to fix the original component parts of our Books are directed against the presupposition of contradictions, incongruences, repetitions, conclusions, and chronicle-like passages, from which the assumption of so many original sources is supposed necessarily to flow (see above).

The kernel of EWALD'S hypothesis is the assumption of a great comprehensive Book of Kings, of which our Books formed a component part (*Gesch.* I., 3 ed., p. 193-244). There was first, according to this view, an old historical work, composed soon after Solomon, perhaps in the happy times of Asa, full of very simple narrations of detached events with interspersed remarks, a work distinguished by a beautiful copiousness, lively and abounding in pictures, especially in the narration of wars; of this we have remains in 1 Sam. xiii., xiv., xxx. 26-31; 2 Sam. viii., and also in Judg. xvii. sq., xix.–xxxi. Besides this there existed in the troublous times after Jehu's elevation a work composed by a prophetical writer who was at the same time a Levite, attractive from its high prophetical view of events, and which, commencing with Samuel's birth and labors, as an entirely new beginning in Israelitish history, described, from a prophetical stand-point, principally the establishment of the kingdom with the origin of which Samuel's labors were necessarily connected; of this work large connected remains, in many places in the original fulness and in almost unchanged form, are to be found in the section 1 Sam. i.—1 Kings i., ii. (both which last chapters betray the same hand as the principal parts of First and Second Samuel), and may be followed in scattered traces even to 2 Kings ix. 1—x. 27. According to EWALD, the arrangement of the historical material in this prophetical book may still be clearly seen in First Samuel according to three chief points of view: 1) the basis of the history of the establishment of the kingdom, 1 Sam. i.—vii., Samuel's life, concluded with the summary vii. 15–17. 2) The history

of Saul's rule, 1 Sam. viii.—xiv., with the concluding summary xiv. 47-52. 3) The narration concerning David and Saul, the decline of the latter, the rise of the former, in 1 Sam. xv.—xxxi. In Second Samuel, on the contrary, the original account of David's reign, on account of the revision which it afterwards underwent, cannot be so clearly recognized. Yet its principal features may be seen in the three sections in which David's life is described: 1) The remains of the history of David from Saul's death to his elevation to the throne of all Israel are to be found in 2 Sam. i.—vii. 2) The history of the middle period of David's reign in Jerusalem, whose richer material was most condensed in the work, is found in 2 Sam. viii. 1-14 (the foreign wars and victories, probably an abridgment of the before-mentioned military history), viii. 15-18 (internal organization), ix. (David's ethical attitude towards Saul's house), x.—xx. 22 (David's relation to his own house), xxi. 1-14; xxiv. (the plagues). 3) Out of the latter part of David's life belonged to the work 2 Sam. xx. 25, 26; xxii. xxiii. 1-7, with which the whole section fitly closed. This work, says EWALD, "the best basis for all the widely read histories of the kingdom," was afterwards much revised, and thus on the one hand enlarged, but on the other greatly abridged, as may be seen from passages in which there are allusions and presuppositions in respect to facts and persons that were never before mentioned; so 1 Sam. xiii. 2; xxx. 26-31. In 1 Sam. between chaps. xxiii. and xxx. much of the original work is lost; chaps. xxiv. and xxvi. are by later hands. The sections xxiii. 8-39 and xxi. 15-22 are taken from "Journals of the kings or state-annals." With the fragments of this prophetical work, Ewald holds, and of the first-mentioned more military history are combined in our Books those of another work going over about the same period, and certainly written not much later, which, according to its traces in 1 Sam. v.-viii. and xxxi., did not have the sharply defined character of the other, though similar to it, but was drier and more colorless in style. From its author came probably the narrative of the Period of the Judges from which Judg. iii. 7—xvi. is taken.—A broader, freer form was given to this History of the Kings by a later revision, as appears plainly in our present history of Saul and David in ch. xii.; xv.—xvii.; xxiv.; xxvi.; xxviii.; for these are fragments of from two to three later works. Afterwards the histories of the Kings received their present form in two revisions; first, by the Deuteronomistic redactor soon after the reformation under Josiah, who, adopting the method of the Deuteronomist, sifted, worked up and abridged the material which had been greatly increased by preceding recensions, and for the first time gathered up and skilfully combined what seemed to him the most important parts of the older works, as we see in our present history, 1 Sam. i.—1 Kings ii. The basis of his book was that work of the prophetical narrator, with which, besides the material from other books, he worked in his own additions which were not numerous (1 Sam. vii. 3, 4, a good deal in xii.; 1 Kings ii. 2-4.) The work, thus greatly enlarged by the Deuteronomistic redactor, received its last revision by an author who lived in the second half of the Babylonian Exile, who edited the history of the origin of the kingdom to Solomon's accession (1 Sam. i.—1 Kings ii.), "as good as quite unaltered," according to the preceding redactor, appended some detached pieces from David's biography which he had at first designed to omit, but, for the rest, issued the present Books of Judges, Ruth, Samuel and Kings as a connected whole, inserting the Book of Ruth (written in the midst of the Exile, and the only one retained of a number of similar fragments by the same author), with reference to the absence of genealogical statements about David's descent in the Books of Samuel, just before those Books as a preparation for David's history, while he put the Book of Judges, in its present form, at the head as an introduction to the whole Book of Kings. He did this for the sake of unity in the connection of the whole history after Joshua with the history of the kings; for the internal connection between the Book of Judges and the Books of Samuel is shown in the statement concerning Samson, that he *began* to deliver Israel out of the hand of the Philistines, in which reference is made to the continuation of this history in Eli, Samuel, David. This redactor, properly speaking, merely edited anew the first half of the older large work on the Kings, which goes to 1 Kings ii.; only the second, from 1 Kings iii. on, can rightly be called his own work.

In this assumption of EWALD's of several redactors, too much play is given to conjec-

ture without firm supports in historical data. We have, however, in those three prophetical authorities (1 Chron. xxix. 28–30) and in the chronicles of David (1 Chron. xxvii. 24) ground sufficient to conjecture that our assumed author of the present Books of Samuel followed those authorities, writing from a prophetical stand-point, and according to prophetical points of view. That a special historical work must be assumed, from which to derive 1 Sam. xiii., xiv., in the history of Saul, and 1 Sam. xxx. 26 sq. and 2 Sam. viii. in the military history of David, seems less probable than that the first is to be referred to the written records in the schools of the Prophets, which took careful note of the deeds of Saul and Jonathan, and the two last to the "words (דִּבְרֵי) of the days of David," 1 Chron. xxvii. 24.—The hypothesis of a final shaping of the Book of Kings partly by a Deuteronomistic redactor, partly by a final remodeller and collector in the second half of the Babylonian Exile, has, in relation to the history under discussion (1 Sam. i.—1 Kings ii.), little foundation; and it is simpler and more natural to refer the views in the discourses of Samuel which are termed Deuteronomistic (*e. g.* "return to God with all your hearts and serve him," 1 Sam. vii. 3 and xii. 20, 24) to this prophetical work, the "Words of Samuel," and the collection and addition of the section, 2 Sam. xxi.—xxiv., to the redactor who arranged and prepared the history up to ch. xx. 26. The similarity in language and style between 1 Kings i., ii., and the preceding narrative in 2 Sam. may be explained by the fact that the authors of the two books used the same authority, namely, the prophetical Book of Nathan.—For the rest, EWALD's hypothesis differs from the others mentioned, in that it represents the Book of Kings, as far as it here comes into consideration (from 1 Sam. i. to 1 Kings ii.), leaving out the parts supposed to have been later introduced by various redactors, as having unity and as the finished work of *one* prophetic historian, and avoids the dissection of the historical material which we find in the other hypotheses. NAEGELSBACH rightly remarks, that the additions which this hypothesis ascribes to a Deuteronomistic redactor do not make the eighth part of the whole, and that therefore the general unity of the work is confirmed by them (*ubi sup.*, p. 407). It must also be noted that both the division of the content of the First Book (chs. i.–vii. Samuel, viii.–xiv. Saul, xv.–xxxi. David and Saul), and the division of the Second Book, the history of David's government according to the theocratic chief points of view which control the entire narrative, cannot be more admirably presented than has been done by EWALD. But from the fact that the content of the books is evidently divided in accordance with such a theocratic-prophetic view of the history of the preparation, genesis and establishment of the theocratic kingdom under Samuel, Saul and David, we are authorized to conclude that the redactor of this history, apart from the prophetical authorities to which he had access, was himself a prophet.

§ 6. THE AUTHOR AND THE TIME OF COMPOSITION.

Having discussed the original sources of our Books, we have now to consider, and in connection with one another, the two questions concerning the author and the time of composition.

What EWALD says (*ubi sup.*, p. 211) of the author of the foundation of the Book of Kings, that he was himself a prophet, we claim for the redactor of our Books on the grounds already discussed at length; but we cannot apply to him what EWALD maintains of the former, namely, that he was also a Levite, which EWALD holds to be clear from the careful account which he takes, in the midst of so many more important events, of the fortunes of the sacred Ark and of the Priests and Levites, and from the considerable acquaintance which he clearly shows with everything pertaining to them. For a prophetical writer as such would have had that lively interest and exact knowledge; he need not have been a Levite. It is, however, further against this view, that in our Books the priesthood recedes in a striking manner into the background over against the prophetic element, and therefore "no historical work is more instructive and important than this for the understanding of the older prophetic order in Israel," as EWALD (*ubi sup.*) well says.

Nothing is known to us of the person and surroundings of the redactor of our Books; on the opinions of the older writers, see CARPZOV, p. 213 sq. THENIUS supposes, not without

reason, that, since he had access to so many good authorities, he could not have been in mean circumstances. "The Talmudical statement, that Samuel wrote the Books called after him is shown to be unhistorical by the simple fact that the history goes beyond Samuel's death" (KEIL, *Introd.* II. 48).—The view in some Introductions, as EICHHORN'S (*Einl.* § 468, p. 529 sq.), JAHN'S (*Einl.*, p. 232 sq.), HERBST'S (*Einl.* II. 1, p. 139 sq.), DE WETTE'S (in the *Beiträge* I., p. 48 sq., but retracted by him in *Einl.* § 186), and others, that our Books had the same author with the Books of Kings, and that therefore their composition is to be put not before the latter part of the Babylonian Exile, or immediately after the Exile, is untenable; for the differences between them in form and content are too great to admit of identity of authorship. In the first place, it is a striking difference that "Kings" quotes its authority in every section, while "Samuel" never does, whence it follows that the author of the latter lived nearer to the events described, the author of the former much farther off. Again, the language is different; numerous traces of the Aramæan dialect occur in "Kings," and almost none at all in "Samuel." In the Books of Kings we see traces from beginning to end of their composition during the Exile, while in the Books of Samuel there is not the slightest reference to the time of the Exile. In the latter there are no direct distinct references to the Law of Moses, while in the former, even before the discovery of the Book of the Law under Josiah, the law is several times spoken of as written (1 Kings ii. 3; 2 Kings xiv. 6; xvii. 37). In our Books mention is made of the various places of worship and sacrifice which existed besides the Ark without blame or hint that this was displeasing to God, while in "Kings" the worship in high places is condemned as illegal. The form of the narrative is quite different also in the two works. In "Kings" the chronological statements are carefully repeated with every king, while the chronological element is almost entirely neglected in "Samuel." The epic breadth and copiousness which the latter shows in many parts is almost wholly lacking in the former, which gives only extracts, usually short, from its authorities to which it refers for wider information. There is no trace here of the standing character-formula which is peculiar to the Books of Kings: "He did that which was right, or evil, in the eyes of the Lord." For all these reasons the author of the Books of Kings cannot be the same with the redactor of the Books of Samuel.—The Rabbinical view, which has had a good many advocates, that Jeremiah is to be regarded as the author of "Samuel" as well as "Kings," because his prophecy has much similarity to them, and here and there corresponds with them in content (a view to which GROTIUS also, on 1 Sam. i. 1, inclines), is similarly untenable; for this proves nothing more than that the author of "Kings" was acquainted with the Book of Jeremiah (see KUEPER, *Jerem. libror. sacr. interpr. atque vindex*, p. 55), and Jeremiah with the Books of Samuel. STAEHELIN (*Krit. Unters.*, p. 137 sq.) infers from our author's friendly attitude towards royalty, from the promises made to the House of David, and from Jeremiah's allusions to these Books, that they were composed under Hezekiah; to which NAEGELSBACH excellently replies, that this is referring to a subjective motive what has a good, objective, historical ground, and Jeremiah might certainly refer to our Books, though they did not originate in his time (p. 411).

If we inquire for positive indications of the time of composition in the content and form of our Books, we can find in the formula "even unto this day" (1 Sam. v. 5; vi. 18; xxx. 25; 2 Sam. iv. 3; vi. 8; xviii. 18), and in the explanation of obsolete expressions (1 Sam. ix. 9) and old customs (2 Sam. xiii. 18) nothing more than the indication of a time of authorship somewhat distant from the events narrated. Nor can anything more definite, least of all the composition after the division of the kingdom, be determined from the mere distinguishing between *Judah* and *Israel* in 1 Sam. xi. 8; xvii. 52; xviii. 16; 2 Sam. ii. 9, 10; iii. 10; v. 1–5; xix. 41 sq.; xx. 2; for this distinction was already usual in the time of Saul and David, being based on the fact (pre-supposed in the passages cited) of such a division, which conditioned the development of the history of David's kingdom. At first only the tribe of Judah adhered to David as its king, the other eleven tribes under the common name *Israel* forming a separate kingdom for seven and a half years under Ishbosheth,* and afterwards for a short time under Absalom.

* [More precisely stated, under the representatives of Saul's House; Ishbosheth was probably not king the whole time.—TR.]

From 2 Sam. v. 5 it appears that the redactor certainly wrote after the death of David, since the whole number of years of his reign is given. But the non-mention of David's death cannot show that he wrote shortly thereafter, as HAEVERNICK (p. 145) maintains; for even if his death had occurred only a short while before, the author could not have maintained silence about it simply because it was generally known, and "not a matter of interest," since he certainly did not write merely for his own contemporaries.—Further, it undoubtedly appears from 1 Sam. xxvii. 6 ("Ziklag pertaineth unto the *kings of Judah* to this day") that our author made his recension after the division of the kingdom into the kingdoms of Judah and Israel. HAEVERNICK's explanation (p. 144) that the "kings of Judah" are not here opposed to those of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, but are the kings who sprang from and ruled Judah, is untenable. The "kings of Judah" can be understood only of the kingdom of Judah which arose after Solomon's time in consequence of the division, in distinction from the kingdom of Israel. It is, however, uncertain at what time after the division the book was composed; probably it was before the destruction of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, since there is no indication that the author knew of the dispersion of an important part of the people (BLEEK, p. 362). "*In general,*" rightly remarks KEIL (*Comm. Introd.*, p. 11), "the content and language of our Books point to the time immediately succeeding the division of the kingdom, since there are no references to the subsequent downfall of the kingdoms, much less to the Exile; and the diction and language is throughout classic and free from Chaldaisms and later forms." That the recension took place not long after the division of the kingdom may be inferred from the fact that worshipping the Lord and offering sacrifices in various places is, as already remarked, regarded not at all as blameworthy, but rather as well-pleasing to God (1 Sam. vii. 5 sq., 17; ix. 13; x. 8; xiv. 35; 2 Sam. xxiv. 18–25). We therefore adopt the hypothesis of THENIUS, who refers (p. xiv.) to 2 Sam. viii. 7; xiv. 27, in which, according to the correct Hebrew text suggested by the Septuagint, there is allusion to Rehoboam, and says of the author, that the notices, in all probability inserted by him, do not reach farther than the time of Rehoboam.—The result of our investigation is, therefore, that the Books of Samuel in their present form were composed by a prophetical writer soon after the division of the kingdom.

[On the sources, date and authorship of "Samuel," see Art. "Books of Samuel" in SMITH'S *Bib. Dict.* and *Introd. to Samuel* in the *Bible Comm.* The latter refers to David's Psalms as one of the sources, points out that twenty or thirty years of the first part of Saul's reign is omitted, and puts the book (as it stands) towards the time of Jeremiah. The difficulty of coming to a satisfactory decision on this point is well brought out by ERDMANN. —TR.]

§ 7. LITERATURE.

THEODORET, *Quæst. in libr.* I., II., Reg. Op. ed., Vaessel, Hal., 1769, Tom. I.; NIK. LYRA, *Postill. in univ.*, S. S. Lugd., 1545; J. BUGENHAGEN, *Annotationes in Deuteron. et Samuel*, Basil., 1524, 8; *Annot. in libros Sam.*, Argentor., 1525, 8; J. MENIUS, *Enarratio in Sam. libr. priorem*, 1532, Viteberg; J. BRENTIUS, *Homil. in libr.* I., *Sam.*, Francof. ad M., 1554, fol.; J. CALVIN, *Homil. in lib. I. Sam.*, Amstelod., 1667, fol.; H. WELLER, *Sam. lib. I. annotationibus explicatus*, Francof., 1555, 56, fol.; P. MARTYR, *Comment. in II. libr. Sam.*, Tig., 1567, 1575, fol.; C. PELLICANUS, *Comment. in libr. Sam.*, Tigur, 1582; V. STRIGEL, *Comment. in libr. Sam., etc.*, Lips., 1591, fol.; PAUL LAURENTIUS, *Gründl. Auslegung über die zwei Bücher Sam.*, Leipz., 1616, fol.; DRUSIUS, *Annot. in loc. diffic. Jos., Judg., Sam.*, Arnh., 1618, 4; C. SANCTIUS, *In 4 libr. Reg., etc., Comm.*, Antwerp, 1624, fol.; *Critici sacri*, T. II., London, 1660; BONFRERE, *Comm. in libr.* (4) *Reg., etc.*, Thor., 1643, 2 Th. fol.; H. GROTIUS, *Annot. in vet. test.*, Paris, 1664, III. Tom.; ed. Vogel, Hal., 1775, T. I.; A. CALOVIUS, *Bibl. illustrata*, T. I., Francof., 1672; S. SCHMID, *In libr. Sam. Comment.*, Argent., 1687, ff. II. Tom. 4; JOH. AD. OSIANDER, *Comm. in I. et II. lib. Sam.*, Tubing., 1687, fol.; JOH. OLEARIUS, *Bibl. Erklärung der ganzen Heiligen Schrift*, Leipz., 1678, fol. V. Theil; POLUS, *Synopsis criticor.*, Francof. ad M., 1694; J. CLERICUS, *Vet. test. libri historici*, Amstelod., 1708, fol.; DATHE, *Lib. histor. vet. test. Jos., Jud., Ruth, Sam., etc.*, Hal., 1784; J. D.

MICHAELIS, *Deutsche Uebersetzung des Alt. Test.*, Göttingen, 1772, Th. 4; J. H. MICHAELIS, *Bibl. hebraica*, Magdeb., 1720; J. CHR. FR. SCHULZE, *Comm. Norimb.*, 1784; NIEMEYER, *Charakteristik der Bibel*, 4, 5, Th. Halle, 1795; HENSLER, *Erläut. des ersten Buchs Sam., etc.*, Hamb., 1795; HOEPFNER *u.* AUGUSTI, *Exeget. Handb. d. A. T.*, Leipz., 1798; MAURER, *Comm.*, Leipz., 1835; CHR. H. KALKAR, *Quæst. biblic. Specim. II.* (*de nonnullis prior. Sam. libr. locis, etc.*), Othin., 1835; O. THENIUS, *Die Bücher Sam. erklärt*, 2 *Aufl.*, Leipzig, 1864 (comp. RUETSCHLI in the *Stud. und Krit.*, 1866, p. 207 f.); C. FR. KEIL, *Bibl. Komm. über die prophet. Geschichtsbücher des Alt. Test. II. Die Bücher Sam.*, Leipz., 1864 [Eng. Tr. KEIL on Samuel]; BUNSEN, *Die Bibel, etc., II., Die Propheten.*

V. DIETRICH, *Summarien*, 1578, Nürnb. fol.; L. OSIANDER, *Deutsche Bibel Luthers mit Erklärung, von* D. FOERSTER, Stuttg., 1600, fol.; PFLEICKER, *Predigten über das erste Buch Sam.*, Tüb., 1605, fol.; DAN. WUELFFER, *Saul Exrex, Predigten über die Historien des Königs Saul*, Nürnb., 1670, 4; CRAMER, *Summarien und bibl. Auslegung*, 1627, 2 *Aufl.*, Wolfenbüttel, 1681, fol.; VIETOR, *David's, Leben und Regierung in Predigten*, Nürnb., 1690, 4; WUERTEMBERG, *Summarien und Auslegungen der Heil. Schrift; Das A. T.*, von J. K. ZELLER, Stuttg., 1677; *vermehrt herausgegeben durch die theol. Fakult. in Tübingen*, Leipz., 1709, 4; GOTTF. KOHLREIF, *Betrachtungen über* 30 *auserlesene Oerter aus d. Büch. Sam.*, Ratzeburg, 1717, 8; *Berlenb. Bib.*, 2 Th., 1728, fol.; JOACHIM LANGE, *Biblisch-historisches Licht und Recht*, Halle u. Leipz., 1734, fol.; CHR. M. PFAFF, *Biblia d. i. die ganze Heil. Schrift. mit Summarien und Anmerk*, Tubing., fol. 8 *Aufl.* Speier, 1767; STARKE, Synopsis II.; RICHTER, *erklärte Hausbibel A. T. II.*, Barmen., 1835; LISKO, *Das A. T. mit Erklärungen I. Die histor. Bücher*, Berlin, 1844; O. v. GERLACH, *Das A. T. mit Einl. und erklärend. Anmerk.*, 2 B., Berl. 1846 (5 *Aufl.*, 1867); CALWER, *Handbuch d. Bibelerklärung I.*, Calw. *und* Stuttg., 1849; DAECHSEL, *Die Bibel, mit in den Text eingeschalteter Auslegung, mit einem Vorwort von* DR. A. HAHN, General-Superintendent, *etc.*, I. 1, *Die Geschichtsbücher*, Heft 11–14, Bresl. 1865 sqq., bei DUELFER; *Betbibel*, 2 B. Eisleben, 1863.

M. FR. ROOS, *Einl. in die bibl. Geschichten.—neuer Abdruck*, Stuttg., 1857, Th. 2; EISENLOHR, *Das Volk Israel unter d. Herrschaft d. Könige*, 2 Th., Leipz., 1856; J. SCHLIER, *Die Könige in Israel, ein Handbüchlein zur heil. Geschich.*, 1859; HASSE, *Gesch. d. Alt. Bundes*, 1863; STAEHELIN, *Das Leben David's eine histor. Untersuchung*, Basel, 1866.

J. SCHLIER, *König Saul, Bibelstunden*, Nördl., 1867; J. DISSELHOFF, *Die Gesch. König Saul's—elf Predigten*, 4 *Aufl.* Kaiserswerth a. Rh., 1867; FR. ARNDT, *Der Mann nach dem Herzen Gottes*, 19 Predigten über d. Leben David's, Berl., 1836; F. W. KRUMMACHER, *David, der König v. Israel, ein biblisches Lebensbild*, Berlin, 1867; J. DISSELHOFF, *Die Gesch. König David's, des Mannes nach dem Herzen Gottes*, 14 Predigten, 3 *Aufl.* Kaiserswerth a. Rh., 1867; J. SCHLIER, *König David, Bibelstunden*, Nördling., 1870; J. RUPERTI, *Licht und Schatten aus d. Gesch. des Alt. Bundes, I. Samuel der Prophet*, Hermannsburg, 1870.

[Besides Dictionaries of the Bible (ERSCH *u.* GRUBER, WINER, HERZOG, KITTO, FAIRBAIRN, SMITH), Introductions (DE WETTE, KEIL, BLEEK, DAVIDSON), and Geographical Works (RELAND, LIGHTFOOT, BOCHART, RITTER, ROBINSON, STANLEY'S *Sinai and Palestine*, THOMSON'S *The Land and the Book*, PORTER in MURRAY'S *Handbook*), the following additional aids may be mentioned:

1. **Jewish Commentaries.**—R. SOLOMON ISAAKI (Rashi), eleventh cent., in BUXTORF'S *Biblia Rabbinica*, and Lat. translation by J. F. BREITHAUPT, Gothæ, 1714; R. DAVID KIMCHI (Radak), 13th cent., in BUXTORF; R. LEVI BEN GERSHOM (Ralbag), thirteenth cent., in BUXTORF; ABARBANEL, fifteenth century. Good suggestions may be gotten from these.

2. **Patristic.**—JEROME, *Quæst. in Sam.; AUGUSTINE, Quest.* and *De Civ. Dei Lib.* 17; GREGORY THE GREAT, *Comm.;* CHRYSOSTOM, *Homilies on Hannah and on David.*

3. **Continental.**—LUDOVICUS DE DIEU, *Critica Sacra*, Amstelaedami, 1693, full of valuable grammatical observations; *Die Israelitische Bibel* (L. PHILIPPSON), Leipzig, 1858, represents modern liberal Jewish opinions.

4. **English Commentaries.**—Of the older (generally unscientific and unsatisfactory), PATRICK, LOWTH and WHITBY has much good exposition; WALL'S *Critical Notes* are nearly

useless; GILL has references to Jewish authorities; HENRY is devout; CLARKE is learned, but sometimes erratic and untrustworthy; the *Comprehensive Commentary* is a compilation not without value. Of the later, Bishop WORDSWORTH'S *Holy Bible with Notes* is devout and conservative, and has some useful quotations from patristic writers, but is marred by excessive literalness and allegorizing; the *Critical and Experimental Commentary* by JAMIESON, FAUSSET and BROWN is condensed and clear, useful for those who have not time for wide reading; the *Bible Commentary*, "by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church," is intended to give the results of modern scientific investigation as held by orthodox Anglicans, and is a valuable and generally trustworthy work.

5. **Biographies, Histories**, *etc.*—CHANDLER'S *Critical History of David* and DELANEY'S *History of David* are useful; HUNTER'S *Sacred Biography* (Hannah) and ROBINSON'S *Scripture Characters*, of not much profit; the quaint sagacity and earnest piety of Bp. HALL'S *Contemplations* is well known; KITTO'S *Daily Bible Illustrations* are especially useful in giving vividness to Scripture scenes and persons; STACKHOUSE'S *Hist. of the Bible*, MILMAN'S *Hist. of the Jews*, STANLEY'S *Lectures on the Jewish Church*, EWALD'S *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel* (Eng. transl. *History of Israel*, CLARK'S *Foreign Theolog. Library*), HENGSTENBERG, *Gesch. d. Reiches Gottes u. d. A. B.* (Eng. transl. *Hist. of the Kingdom of God under the Old Covenant*), are valuable; C. KINGSLEY, *Four Sermons on David*, delivered at the University of Cambridge, sprightly and suggestive; W. M. TAYLOR, *David the King of Israel*, New York, 1875, a series of interesting and wholesome discourses; F. D. MAURICE'S *Prophets and Kings of the O. T.* is thoughtful and candid.

6. **On the criticism of the text.**—Besides general works on text criticism and the *Biblia Hebraica* of J. H. MICHAELIS, mentioned above by DR. ERDMANN, we have KENNICOTT'S *Ed. of Heb. Bib.*, Oxford, 1776–80; DE ROSSI, *Variæ Lectiones Vet. Test.*, Parmæ, 1784; THENIUS and KEIL (Eng. tr., CLARK'S *Foreign Theolog. Lib.*), in their commentaries; WELLHAUSEN, *Der Text d. Bücher Sam.*, Göttingen, 1871; foot-notes in EWALD'S *Hist. of Israel; STRACK'S Proleg. Crit. in Vet. Test.;* FRANKEL'S *Vorstudien zur LXX.;* DAVIDSON'S *Biblical Criticism.*—TR.]

THE

FIRST BOOK OF SAMUEL.

FIRST PART. SAMUEL.

1 Sam. I.—VII.

Samuel's Life and Work as Judge, Priest and Prophet, Directed Towards a Thorough Reformation of the Theocracy and Laying the Foundation of the Theocratic Kingdom.

FIRST DIVISION: SAMUEL'S EARLY LIFE.

1 Sam. I.—III.

FIRST SECTION.

Samuel's Birth in Answer to Prayer to the Lord

Chap. I. 1–20.

I. *Samuel's parents, the Ephrathite Elkanah and the childless Hannah.* Vers. 1–8.

1 Now [*om.* Now[1]] there was a certain [*om.* certain] man of Ramathaim-zophim,[2]
of Mount Ephraim, and his name was Elkanah, the son of Jeroham, the son of
2 Elihu, the son of Tohu, the Son of Zuph, an Ephrathite. And he had two wives;
the name of the one was Hannah, and the name of the other Peninnah; and Pe-
3 ninnah had children, but [and] Hannah had no children. And this man went up
yearly out of [from] his city to worship and to sacrifice unto the Lord [Jehovah]
of hosts [Hosts] in Shiloh. And the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, the
priests of the Lord, were there [And there the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phine-
4 has, were priests of Jehovah[3]]. And when the time was that Elkanah offered, he
5 gave to Peninnah his wife, and to all her sons and her daughters, portions; but
unto Hannah he gave a worthy [double[4]] portion, for he loved Hannah, but [and]
6 the Lord [Jehovah] had shut up her womb. And her adversary also [*om.* also]
provoked her sore [*ins.* also], for [*om.* for] to make her fret because[5] the Lord [Je-
7 hovah] had shut up her womb. And as he did so [And so it happened[6]] year by
year; when she went up to the house of the Lord [Jehovah], so she [she thus] pro-

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. The ו, being a part of the introductory narrative-formula, and not a connective with some other narrative, is better rendered by the presentative "now" than by the connective "and;" and is best omitted entirely.—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 1. Vat. has Σιφά, which points to צוּפִי "a Zuphite;" Targ. renders "of the disciples of the prophets," Pesh. "from the hill of the watchers," both of which point to the present text, but are not probable translations.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 3. It is not said that these were the only priests.—Tr.].

[4] [Ver. 5. See Notes, *in loco*.—Tr].

[5] [Ver. 6. It was over this that the adversary designed to make Hannah fret.—Tr.].

[6] [Ver. 7. The verb is probably to be pointed יֵעָשֶׂה.—Tr.].

8 voked her, therefore [and] she wept and did not eat. Then said Elkanah her hus-
band [And Elkanah her husband said] to her, Hannah, why weepest thou? and
why eatest thou not? and why is thy heart grieved? am not I better to thee than
ten sons?

II. *Hannah's Prayer for a Son.* Vers. 9–18 *a.*

9 So [And] Hannah rose up after they [she[7]] had eaten in Shiloh, and after they
[she[7]] had drunk. Now [And] Eli the priest sat upon a [the] seat by a [the] post
10 of the temple [Sanctuary[8]] of the Lord [Jehovah]. And she was in bitterness of
11 soul, and prayed unto the Lord [Jehovah], and wept sore. And she vowed a vow,
and said, O Lord of hosts [Jehovah of Hosts], if thou wilt indeed look on the
affliction of thine handmaid, and remember me, and not forget thy handmaid, but
[and] wilt give unto thine handmaid a male-child, then I will give him unto the
Lord [Jehovah] all the days of his life, and there shall no razor come upon his
12 head. And it came to pass, as she continued praying before the Lord [Jehovah],
13 that Eli marked her mouth. Now [And] Hannah, she [*om.* she[9]] spake in her
heart; only her lips moved, but her voice was not heard; therefore [and] Eli
14 thought she had been [was] drunken. And Eli said unto her, How long wilt thou
15 be drunken? put away thy wine from thee. And Hannah answered and said, No,
my lord, I am a woman of a sorrowful spirit; I have drunk neither wine nor strong
16 drink, but have poured out my soul before the Lord [Jehovah]. Count not thine
handmaid for a daughter of Belial [dissolute woman[10]]; for out of the abundance
17 of my complaint and [*ins.* my] grief have I spoken hitherto. Then [And] Eli
answered and said, Go in peace; and the God of Israel grant *thee* [*om.* thee] thy
18 *a* petition that thou hast asked of him. And she said, Let thine handmaid find grace
in thy sight [thine eyes].

III. *Samuel's Birth.* Vers. 18 *b.*–20.

18 *b* So [And] the woman went her way and did eat, and her countenance was no
19 more *sad.*[11] And they rose up in the morning early, and worshipped before the
Lord [Jehovah], and returned and came to their house to Ramah. And Elkanah
20 knew Hannah his wife; and the Lord [Jehovah] remembered her. Wherefore
[And] it came to pass, when the time was come about, after Hannah had [that
Hannah] conceived, that she [and] bare a son, and called his name Samuel, *saying,*
Because [For, *said she,*] I have [*om.* have] asked him of the Lord [Jehovah].

7 Ver. 9. The Infin. refers here rather to Hannah.—Tr.].

8 [Ver. 9. הֵיכָל is not necessarily "temple," but any large structure.—Tr.].

9 [Ver. 13. The Heb. inserts the pron. הִיא "she," but our Eng. does not well permit it.—Tr.].

10 [Ver. 16. בְּלִיַּעַל "worthlessness" should not be rendered as a proper name in O. T.; Eng. A. V. frequently renders "sons of B." by "ungodly" or "wicked."—Tr.].

11 [Ver. 18. See Notes.—Tr.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.*

I. *Samuel's Parents.* Vers. 1–8.

Vers. 1, 2. **And there was a man of Ramathaim-zophim.**—Here an account is given of *Samuel's genealogy and birth-place.*

There is no sufficient ground for adopting (as Thenius does) the reading of the Sept. MS. R. (Vat.) אִישׁ הָיָה [there was a man] instead of וַיְהִי אִישׁ [and there was a man], since this latter does not affect the independence of the Books of Samuel; for the ו [and] does not indicate attachment to something preceding, the continuation of the Book of Judges, but וַיְהִי [and there was] stands here, as it often does at the beginning of a narrative, as historical introductory formula, Jos. i. 1; Judg. i. 1; Ruth i. 1; 2 Sam. i. 1; 1 Kings i. 1; Esth. i. 1; Ezra i. 1; Ezek. i. 1; Jonah i. 1.

The *father* of Samuel was a man of Ramathaim-zophim in the hill-country of Ephraim, named Elkanah. The *place Ramathaim* (הָרָמָתַיִם) is doubtless the same that is called in ver. 3 "his city," and afterwards in ver. 19 and ii. 11 by the shorter name *Ramah* (הָרָמָה), whence it appears that it was not merely the family-residence, but also Elkanah's abode, where he had "his house." The full name Ramathaim-*zophim* is found here only. The dual "Two-hills" points to the site of the place as on the sides or summits of two hills. It is the birth-place of Samuel (ver. 19), the same Ramah in which he had his house (vii. 17), the central point of his labors (viii. 4; xv. 34; xvi. 13; xix. 18-22) and his abode as long as he lived, and where he was buried (xxvi. 1; xxviii. 3). But this Ramah of Samuel, according

* [In the German "*exegetische erläuterungen,*" "exegetical explanations."—Tr.].

to Pressel's clear statement in Herzog (*R.-E. s. v.* Rama), is most probably identical with the Ramah in the tribe of Benjamin (Jos. xviii. 25); for the statement of Josephus (Ant. 8, 12, 3) that Ramathon,* which = רָמָתַיִם [Ramathaim] and is therefore doubtless the Ramah of Samuel, was forty Stadia from Jerusalem, and that of Eusebius (Onomast. s. v. *'Αρμαθὲμ*) that it was somewhat farther north in a line from Jerusalem towards Bethel, carry us into the territory of Benjamin. If it be urged against this view that, according to Judg. iv. 5 and this passage, Ramah of Samuel was in the mountains of Ephraim, and therefore in the Tribe-territory of Ephraim, it is to be observed on the other hand that the mountains of Ephraim stretch into the Tribe of Benjamin, and not only include its northern mountains, but extend towards Jerusalem and unite with the mountains of Judah. The Ramah of Samuel lay in Benjamin near Gibeah, Saul's home, and Mizpah. The addition *zophim* (צוֹפִים) distinguishes it from the other places of the same name, and indicates the district (the land of Zuph ix. 5) in which it lay, whose name is to be derived from the family of Zuph or Zophim from whom Elkanah descended (comp. 1 Chr. vi. 11, 20). Since, according to this, Zophim indicates a region, which took its name from the descendants of Zuph, the place Sôba, which has lately been discovered west of Jerusalem, cannot be the Ramah of Samuel, as Robinson and Ritter suppose (see Then. *sächs. exeget. Studien*, II. 134 sq., and Ewald, *Gesch.* II. 595). It is rather to be sought in the site of the present Er-Ram between four and five (Eng.) miles, as Josephus states, from Jerusalem on the summit or side of a conical mountain on the road from Jerusalem to Bethel. When Saul (in ch. ix. 5) comes into the "land of Zuph," he straightway finds Samuel in "this city." That "this city," Samuel's abode, is identical with Ramathaim-zophim here is beyond doubt. But against the view that it, together with the region "Zuph," belonged to Benjamin, and in support of the view that it is different from Ramah of Benjamin, and lay in the territory of Ephraim, the principal consideration adduced is Saul's route (ix. 4—x. 2): on the return from Ramah to Gibeah, Saul, it is said, certainly took the directest road; but, according to x. 2-5, he first crossed the border of Benjamin (x. 2), and then came into the neighborhood of Bethel (x. 3), which lay close to the border of Benjamin and Ephraim; according to this, Ramah of Samuel was situated north of Bethel in Ephraim not far from Gibeah (ver. 20) but near Shiloh (ch. i. 24), for if it had been far from Shiloh, the animals for offering would not have been carried from home. So Then. on ix. 5, p. 34. But the assumption that Saul went the directest way to Gibeah is not certain. In ver. 3, remarks Winer correctly (*W.-B. s. v.*), nothing is said really of the neighborhood of Bethel, but only that Saul should meet men who were going to Bethel, from what direction we know not. And Ramah of Benjamin was so near Shiloh, that there was no need† to drive thither the animals which could not easily be purchased on the spot.* The other geographical term אֶפְרָתִי "Ephraimite" (which must not be connected with צוּף (Luth.) in which case it would have been הָאֶפְרָתִי) certainly describes Elkanah as an Ephraimite, who belonged not only to the mountains, but also to the Tribe of Ephraim—and not as a Bethlehemite, as Hoffmann (*Weissag. u. Erfüll.* II. 61) and Robinson (Pal. II., 583 [Am. ed. ii. 7 sq.]) suppose; for in xvii. 12 and Ruth i. 2, to which appeal is made, the word is further expressly defined by the phrase "of Bethlehem." "It by no means follows, however, from this description of Elkanah (comp. Then. p. 2) that Ramathaim-zophim pertained to the territory of Ephraim, but only that Elkanah's family had settled in this Ramah, and had afterwards moved to Ramah in Benjamin" (Keil, p. 18). As Elkanah came from the Levitical family of Kohath, son of Levi, whose land lay in Ephraim, Dan and Manasseh (Josh. xxi. 5, 21 sq.), and as the Levites generally were counted as citizens of the tribes in which their residence was, it is not strange that Elkanah is here designated as an Ephraimite according to his descent, while he *lived* in Benjamin, whither his forefathers had immigrated.

The *family* of Elkanah is here traced back only through four generations to צוּף "Zuph," no doubt with reference to the preceding designation *Zophim*, because Zuph had settled in this district with his family, and it had taken its name from him. It would therefore properly be written צוּפִים "Zuphim." This explanation of the name is certainly more natural than that which supposes that the district in which it lay, the "land of Zuph" (ix. 5) was so called from its abundant supply of water, and than the explanation of some Rabbis, "Ramathaim of the watchers or prophets." [The first question with regard to this word, whether we read Zophim or, with Erdmann, Zuphim, is a grammatical one: is the combination Ramathaim-zophim in accordance with Heb. usage? In proper names the rule is that the first word of a compound is in the construct state, but the two exceptions, compounds with אָבֵל "meadow," Gen. l. 11, *etc.*, and שָׁוֵה "plain," Gen. xiv. 5, seem to prove the possibility of an appositional construction, so that we must admit (against Wellhausen "*Der Text. d. Bücher Sam.*" *in loco*) Ramathaim-zophim to be a possible form. But, as "Zophim" never appears again as an appendage to Ramathaim, and the old vss. Chald. and Syr. render it as an appellative, it would perhaps be better, with Wellhausen, to suppose that the final ם *m* comes by error of transcription

* [So Josephus; but the text of Erdmann has Ramathaim.—Tr.]

† [That is, it was not necessary to drive the animals thither beforehand, since, the distance being so small, they could be sent for when needed.—Tr.]

* [The difficulties in the way of identifying Ramathaim (-Zophim) on the supposition that it is the same with "this city" (ix. 6) are almost insuperable. The conditions to be met are 1) the place is in Mt. Ephraim; 2) it is apparently south of Rachel's tomb (1 Sam. x. 2); 3) it was Samuel's residence Ramah. They decide the question against Er-Ram, which is north of Rachel's tomb. The only solution is that which rejects the above supposition. If the city in which Saul was anointed was some other place, or Saul's residence at that time was not Gibeah, then Er-Ram may be Ramah, and in other respects this answers better than any other place to the circumstances. But the question must be regarded as undecided. See Stanley's "Sinai and Palestine," Note to ch. 4, and Mr. Grove's Articles ("Ramah," "Ramathaim") in Smith's Dictionary, with Dr. Wolcott's additional remarks.—Tr.]

from the following word, and to read צוּפִי "a Zuphite," which would then correspond to the "Zuph" at the end as "an Ephraimite" does to "Mount Ephraim."—Tr.]. From a comparison of the two genealogies in 1 Chr. vi. 26, 27 (Heb. 11, 12) 34, 35 (Heb. 19, 20) with this genealogy of Samuel it appears that they agree except in the last three names, which in the first list in Chr. are Eliab, Nahath and Zophai, and in the second, Eliel, Toah and Ziph. They are plainly the same names with various changes of form. These changes are probably to be ascribed to differences of pronunciation or to the mis-writing of the original forms which are preserved in this passage (comp. Then. 2).

The *Levitical descent* of Elkanah and Samuel is put beyond doubt by a comparison of the genealogy here with those in Chronicles. In the first of these, 1 Chr. vi. 22 sq. (Heb. 7 sq.) the genealogical list descends from the second son of Levi, Kohath, to Samuel and his sons; in the second, ver. 33 sq. (Heb. 18 sq.), it ascends from the singer Heman, Samuel's grandson, to Kohath, Levi and Israel. These Levites of the Family of Kohath had their dwellings appointed them in the tribes of Ephraim, Dan, and Manasseh. As the Levites were usually designated by the tribes in which their dwellings were fixed (Hengstenb. *Beitr.* [Contributions] *zur Einl. ins. A. T.* III. 61), the name "Ephraimite" here cannot be adduced against the Levitical descent of Samuel, as is done by Knobel (II. 29, Anm. 2), Nägelsbach (Herzog, *R.-E. s. v.* Samuel) and others. The latter himself refers to Judg. xvii. 7 and xix. 1 as cases where a Levite is described as belonging to another tribe, but thinks it strange that, while in those passages the Levitical descent of the men is also expressly mentioned, Elkanah's descent from Levi is here not hinted at, and this is all the more surprising, if he was really a Levite, when his ancestor came from Ephraim to Ramah and gave his name to the region. But the author of the Book of Judges had a special motive for mentioning the Levitical character of those persons, while our author had little or none, since in his narrative of Samuel he lays all the stress on his prophetic office, and writes, as we have seen, from a prophetic stand-point. There was the less need to emphasize Samuel's Levitical character because, as Ewald (II. 594) remarks, the Levites that were not of Aaron's family, seem in early times to have been more blended with the people. And the statement in "Chronicles" of Samuel's Levitical descent was not occasioned by the fact that the prophet performed priestly functions (Knobel *ubi sup.*), nor is it to be explained by saying that perhaps quite early the conviction that Samuel *must* have been a Levite grew out of the difficulty which every Levite must have felt at the discharge of priestly duties by Samuel, if he were not of the stem of Levi (Nägelsbach, *ubi sup.*)—nor to be referred, with Thenius (p. 2), to the fact that, perhaps in later times the genealogy given in our Book was attached to that of Levi in order thus to justify Samuel's offering sacrifices. "Chronicles" throughout makes its statistical-historical statements from the Levitical point of view, and thus supplements the history of David and Samuel in our Book. Hengstenberg well says (*ubi sup.*): "We cannot suppose these genealogies to be an arbitrary invention, simply because, if the author had been disposed to this, he would doubtless have put Samuel among the descendants of Aaron." Ewald remarks, "Any one who looks narrowly at the testimony in 'Chronicles' cannot possibly doubt that Samuel was of a Levitical family," while our author attached no importance to this fact (*ubi sup.* Anm. 2). So Bunsen (*in loco*), referring to Josh. xxi. 21, where the dwellings of the Kohathites are fixed in Mount Ephraim also, says: "The Levitical descent of Samuel is certain; only it is not made specially prominent here." Nägelsbach himself is obliged to admit that the proofs of Samuel's Levitical descent are convincing; for 1) looking at "Chronicles" (1 Chr. xxv. 4; comp. vi. 18 sq.), he is obliged to concede that Samuel's posterity is very decidedly considered as belonging to the Levites, since Heman, the renowned singer, grandson of Samuel and father of a numerous posterity, has an eminent place in the lists of Levites of David's day; and 2) he urges further as a not unimportant consideration the name of Samuel's father, "Elkanah, that is, he whom God acquired or purchased," for this name is both in signification and use exclusively a Levite name, and all the Elkanahs mentioned in the Old Test. (leaving out the one in 2 Chr. xxviii. 7, whose tribe is not stated) were demonstrably Levites, and belonged mostly to the family of Korah from whom Samuel also was descended. See *Simonis Onomast.*, p. 493; Hengstenb., *ubi supra* 61; Keil *in loco.*—The further objection is made that Samuel was really dedicated to the Sanctuary-service by his mother's vow, which would not have been necessary if Elkanah had been a Levite. To this the answer is not that Hannah's vow referred to the Nazariteship of her son—for though all Nazarites were specially consecrated to the Lord, they did not thereby come under obligation to serve in the Sanctuary like the Levites—but rather that in Hannah's vow the words "all the days of his life" (vers. 11 and 22) are to be emphasized. While she consecrates him to the Lord as Nazarite, she at the same time by her vow devotes him for his whole life to the service of the Lord in the Sanctuary; while the Levites did not enter the service till the age of twenty-five or thirty (Numb. viii. 23 sq.; iv. 23, 30, 47), and then needed not to remain constantly at the Sanctuary, Samuel as soon as he is weaned is destined by his mother to continual service there (ver. 22), and while yet a boy wears there the priestly dress. —It is again urged against the Levitical descent of Elkanah that, according to the Septuagint rendering of ver. 21 (which adds πάσας τὰς δεκάτας τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ "all the tithes of his land"), he brought tithes (Then.); but the genuineness of this addition is very doubtful, and, even if it be received, the bringing of tithes is no evidence of Elkanah's non-Levitical character (Josephus, who relates the Levitical descent, makes no difficulty in speaking of the tithe-bringing), for, according to the Law, the Levites had to bestow on the priests, as gift of Jehovah, one-tenth of the tenth which they themselves received from the other tribes, Numb. xviii. 26 sq.; comp. Neh. x. 38 (Keil 26, Note). Ewald (II. 594) says: "The tithe which Elkanah (according to i. 21, Sept.) brought proves nothing against his Levitical cha-

racter." See his *Alterthümer* (Archæology), p. 346. Thenius refers the fulfilment of the prophecy in 1 Sam. ii. 35 to Samuel, and thereon bases the assertion that Samuel's Levitical descent is set aside by the prophecy; but, even if his reference be conceded, this consequence does not follow, for in this prophecy the sense requires us to emphasize not the priest but what is predicted of him.

חַנָּה, Ἄννα, Hannah (found in Phœnician also; Dido's sister was named Anna), a common name for women among the Hebrews, signifying "charm," "favor," "beauty," and in a religious sense "grace."

Elkanah's bigamy with Hannah and Peninnah ("coral," "pearl"), like the custom of taking concubines along with the proper wives, is fundamentally opposed to the original divine ordination of monogamy. The Mosaic Law does not forbid polygamy, but never expressly approves it; it accepts it as a custom and seeks to restrict and govern it by various regulations (Lev. xviii. 18; Ex. xxi. 7-10; Deut. xvii. 17; xxi. 15-17). According to Gen. iv. 19 it was a Cainite, Lamech, that first violated the original ordinance. As it was usually only the men of more wealth and higher position that took two or more wives, we may suppose that Elkanah was a wealthy man.—The curse which attached to this relation appears in Elkanah's married and family-life; Peninnah, who was blessed with children, exalts herself haughtily above the childless Hannah, and embitters her soul. The resulting discord in the family-life shows itself at the holy place, where Hannah's heart is continually troubled by her "adversary," while Elkanah seeks to console her by all the more affectionate conduct.

Vers. 3–5. *Elkanah's yearly worship and sacrifice at Shiloh.* **And this man went up,** *etc.**—The expression "from year to year" (מִיָּמִים ׳) is used in Ex. xiii. 10 of the Feast of Unleavened Bread and so elsewhere (Judg. xi. 40; xxi. 19). On the traces of the Passover in the Period of the Judges see Hengstenberg *Beitr.* [Contrib.] III. 79-85. It is this Feast that is meant here. For Elkanah is said in the text to have traveled regularly every year with his whole household (ver. 21) to the Sanctuary. This journey was not taken at pleasure, but at an appointed time, and therefore at one of the festivals at which the people were required by the Law to appear before the Lord, Ex. xxxiv. 23; comp. Deut. xvi. 16. It was only at the Passover that the whole family were accustomed to go up to the Sanctuary, only then that every man without exception went. But Elkanah attended the feast regularly only *once* a year. Nothing but the Passover, therefore, can be meant here. At this feast Elkanah went up once every year to the Sanctuary with his whole family. [This statement—that the feast which Elkanah attended was the Passover—would be probable, if we could assume regularity in carrying out the Mosaic Law at this time; but this cannot be assumed. See Judges xvii., xviii., xix.; 1 Sam. ii. 12-17. Some prefer to see here a feast different from any of the three great festivals, referring to the feasting (ver. 9) and David's "yearly sacrifice," 1 Sam. xx. 6; comp. Deut. xii. 11-14 (*Bib. Comm. in loco*). This, however, is not conclusive; feasting would be appropriate at the great festivals, (see Lev. xxiii. 40; Neh. viii. 12); and the question what occasion this was must be left undecided.—Tr.].

To worship and to sacrifice.—The beautiful picture of Israelitish piety which we have in the following account of Elkanah and Hannah is introduced by these features as the chief and fundamental ones. The *worship* relates to the *name* of the Lord who dwells in His chosen place in the Sanctuary, and is the expression of the remembrance of this name before the Lord. The *sacrifice* is the embodied prayer; in the sacrifice worship is presented to the Lord as the act by which the offerer brings himself, and all that he has, to the Lord. According to the Law (Ex. xxiii. 15; xxxiv. 20; comp. Deut. xvi. 16) those who came to the Sanctuary to attend the festival were not to appear empty-handed before the Lord, but "every man shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the Lord thy God which He hath given thee." The לִזְבֹּחַ ("to sacrifice") is to be understood of the Shelamim, which consisted of free-will offerings (Deut. xvi. 10), partly from the tithes set apart for this purpose (Deut. xiv. 22 sq.) and the first-born of cattle (Deut. xv. 20; Numb. xviii. 17), which were preceded by burnt offerings, (Numb. x. 10) and followed by joyful feasting. (Oehler, Herzog *R.-E.* IV. 386). With reference to this sacrificial meal, which belonged essentially to the *peace-offerings* (Shelamim), the whole act of sacrifice is designated by זֶבַח, because this word denotes slaying with reference to a meal to be afterwards held, and the expressions שְׁלָמִים (peace-offerings) and זְבָחִים (sacrifices) are exactly equivalent, the זָבַח זֶבַח ("to sacrifice a sacrifice") being used of the Shelamim. This peace-offering, whose performance is called זֶבַח "slaughter," was preceded by a sin-offering and a burnt-offering, of which the former removed the alienation from God occasioned by sin, and the latter through the worship offered made the offerer acceptable in the sight of God; and thus the peace-offering was the representation and confirmation of the relation of integrity, the peaceful and friendly communion between the Lord and the man who was *brought near* to Him (שָׁלֵם *integer fuit*); comp. Oehler in Herzog X. 637, Hengstenb. *Beitr.* III., p. 85 sq.

To the Lord of Hosts, *Jehovah Sabaoth.* Elkanah draws near with worship and with sacrifice. The signification of the name יְהוָה [Jahveh, which probably, and not Jehovah, is the correct pronunciation,—Tr.] is the ground of the worship and of the presentation of the offering. The living, unchangeable eternal God, who by His historical self-revelation as His people's Covenant-God has prepared Himself the *name* by which

* The addition of the Sept. ἐξ Ἀρμαθαίμ does not warrant the supposition that the corresponding Heb. expression has fallen out after מֵעִירוֹ, but seems to be an explanation of the translator.—מִיָּמִים ׳ not "at his usual time" (Luther), nor "*statutis diebus*" but "from year to year," *yearly* (Ex. xiii. 10), comp. ii. 19; זֶבַח הַיָּמִים "the *yearly* offering."

they are to know and call Him, and by which He comes into direct intercourse with them, has thus first made possible for His people the worship and sacrifice which they are to bring to His honor, and also made it a sacred duty.

In Shiloh Elkanah brings his offering to the Lord of Hosts. Shiloh (שִׁלֹה, that is, "Rest") lay in the territory of Ephraim, "on the north side of Bethel, on the east side of the highway that goeth up from Bethel to Shechem and on the south of Lebonah," Judg. xxi. 19. Here the Sanctuary of Israel, the Tabernacle with the Ark, which immediately after the entrance into Canaan was placed in Gilgal (fifty stadia from Jordan, ten from Jericho), was located from the time mentioned in Josh. xviii. 1 (the sixth year after the passage of the Jordan according to *Joseph. Ant.* V., i. 19), to the capture of the Ark by the Philistines. For a time only, during the Benjamite war (Judg. xx. 27), the Ark was in Bethel. Shiloh was the permanent seat of the Sanctuary till the unfortunate Philistine war under Eli. And this Sanctuary was, during the whole period of the Judges up to Samuel's time when the Ark fell into the hands of the Philistines, the only one that the people of Israel had, the national Sanctuary instituted by Moses, where men came into the presence of the Lord, where all sacrifices were offered and the great festivals celebrated, where the whole nation assembled: the dwelling, the house, the temple of God (vers. 7, 9, 22). In regard to *Shiloh* as the religious centre of the people during the whole period of the Judges on account of the location there of the Sanctuary with the Ark by Joshua, see for further details Hengstenb. *Beitr.* [Contrib.] III., p. 52 sq. Shiloh was the home of the prophet Ahijah under Jeroboam II. (1 Ki. xi. 12, 14) and was still in existence at the time of the Exile (Jer. xli. 5). Jerome found there some ruins and the foundation of an altar (see on Zeph. i. 14). According to Robinson (III. 302 sq. [Am. ed. II. 267–270]) and Wilson (*The Lands of the Bible*, II. 292 sq.) the ancient Shiloh is the present ruin Seilûn, whose situation answers exactly to the description in Judg. xxi. 19. The position of the place was such that, in accordance with its name, the Sanctuary of Israel could there have a quiet permanent place. This quiet place, situated on a hill (Ps. lxxviii. 54) was the scene of the mighty revolution brought about in the history of the Theocracy by the call of Samuel to be the Prophet of God and by the overthrow of the priestly house of Eli.

Instead of "and there the two sons, *etc.*" (וְשָׁם שְׁנֵי ב׳) the Sept. gives *καὶ ἐκεῖ Ἡλὶ καὶ οἱ δύο υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ* ("and there Eli and his two sons," ver. 3), as if the text had read "and there Eli," *etc.* (וְשָׁם עֱלִי); but this is clearly a change of the original text occasioned by the fact, which seemed strange to the translator, that not Eli but his two sons are mentioned at the beginning of the Book. This mention of the priests accords with the following narrative, which speaks of the sacrificial function, which Eli on account of age no longer discharged. Eli, though termed only priest, yet filled the office of High-priest, but had made over the priestly duties to his sons; hence it is that they, and not he, are here specially mentioned as persons who were priests to *the Lord* (כֹּהֲנִים לַיהוה), by which it is intimated that there were others who performed this priestly service before the Lord. From the fact that only these two, with their father, are here mentioned expressly, it has been concluded that the Priesthood was numerically very meagre and simple; but this conclusion is wholly unfounded; for, on the one hand, not all the priests are mentioned here, but only the two who figure in the succeeding history and illustrate the corruption of the Priesthood, and, on the other hand, from the fact that all Israel sacrificed at the Sanctuary at Shiloh it is clear that two or three priests would not suffice for the service, comp. ii. 14, 16. What a contrast is given us here in the two sons of Eli, representatives of a priesthood inwardly estranged from God and sunk in immorality, and the pious God-fearing Elkanah and his consecrated wife Hannah!

Ver. 4. "The day" (הַיּוֹם), that is, on the day when he came to Shiloh to sacrifice.*

That Elkanah's sacrifice (זֶבַח) was a praise or thank-offering is clear from what follows; for, according to the Law (Lev. vii. 15) the flesh of this offering, of which the offerer kept a part, had to be eaten on the day on which it was brought. This *praise-offering* or *thank-offering* is (Lev. vii. 11 sq.) the first and principal sort of the peace-offering (זֶבַח עַל־תּוֹדָה – שְׁלָמִים or זֶבַח תּוֹדַת שׁ׳, vers. 13, 15), the sacrifice of the thankful recognition of God's undeserved benefits. The second sort of peace-offering is the vow-offering (נֶדֶר), which was promised when a request was made for God's favor, and offered when it was granted; the third sort is the free-will-offering (נְדָבָה) for a special experience of God's favor, and in a wider sense a voluntary contribution to the Sanctuary and its furniture [Ex. xxxv. 29.—Tr.].—Elkanah's *whole family* took part in the feasts which he made there from the Shelamim [peace-offerings] in accordance with the provision of the Law, Deut. xii. 11, 12, 17, 18. These meals had a *joyful* character, comp. Deut. xii. 12; xvi. 11; xxvii. 7. In Elkanah's household this joy was *disturbed* all the while by the childlessness of Hannah.

While he divided to Peninnah and her children their pieces, parts, portions of the flesh of the offering, he gave Hannah

Ver. 5. מָנָה אַחַת אַפָּיִם. Of the various explanations of these words (in which the אַפָּיִם makes the difficulty), only two now deserve consideration; the first (Syr., Targ., Gesen., Winer, De Wette, Bunsen, Keil [Wordsworth, *Bib. Com.*, Cahen]) takes אַפָּיִם in the sense of "*persons*," so that it would read "a portion for two persons," or "for persons" ([Fürst], Bunsen, that is, "a large piece"); the second (Thenius, Böttcher, "*neue exeget. krit. Aehrenlese z.* A. T.", p. 85 sq.) after the Vulgate and Luther renders אַפָּיִם "*sad*," or better, "*displeased*," "*unwilling*." Against the first

* [The phrase וַיְהִי הַיּוֹם means "once," or "it happened once," the Heb. using the Def. Art. (because the day is defined by what follows) where we use an indefinite phrase. See 2 Kings iv. 8, 11, 18.—Tr.]

explanation is the fact that the sing. אַף never has the meaning "person," nor can it be shown that this meaning belongs to the dual; it means "countenance," but it is only by forcing that the signification "person" can thence be gotten (Keil) on the ground that לְאַפֵּי is equivalent to לִפְנֵי in 1 Sam. xxv. 23, and פָּנִים is used for "person" in 2 Sam. xvii. 11. It is, however, on linguistic grounds, better to explain the word, according to its usual signification, as expressing a displeased disposition or emotion, akin to anger. It is then to be taken adverbially (as, for example, the opposite feeling נְדָבָה, Deut. xxiii. 24; Hos. xiv. 5) equivalent to בְּאַפַּיִם in Dan. xi. 20, "in anger." In contrast with the joy which ought to have reigned undisturbed at this feast, Elkanah's heart was full of sadness because his beloved Hannah remained without the blessing of children, while her adversary, proud of her children, vexed her with it; for childlessness was held to be a great misfortune, a reproach, yea a divine punishment (Gen. xix. 31; xxx. 1, 23). The *one* portion, which alone he could give Hannah, was a contrast to the many portions which he gave to Peninnah and her sons and daughters, and was, as it were, the mark of her desolate despised condition over against the fortunate and boastful Peninnah.

[It is difficult to give any satisfactory rendering of this much-disputed phrase. The word אַפַּיִם has only three meanings in the Old Test. (excluding this passage): 1) nostrils (Gen. ii. 7; Lam. iv. 20); 2) face (1 Sam. xx. 41); 3) anger (1 Sam. xi. 6). The rendering, therefore, "sadness," "displeasure," defended above by Dr. Erdmann, is hardly allowable. Nor does the word mean "person;" in 2 Sam. xvii. 11 (adduced by Keil) the similar word פָּנִים means not "persons," but "presence," and offers no support to this rendering. The Chaldee translation "a chosen portion" takes it in the sense "presence," "a portion worthy to be set in one's presence," as the bread in the Tabernacle was called לֶחֶם פָּנִים "bread of presence," "showbread." Another translation (mentioned by Gesenius, *Thesaurus s. v.*) is "one portion of faces," that is, two slices of bread with meat between. The Syriac translation "double" is apparently based on an accidental resemblance in two words. The Sept. omits the word and renders "one portion," but the context requires an explanatory word here. The original strictly allows only two translations, either "a portion of anger" (so Abarbanel, who speaks of two angers or griefs which Elkanah had), which seems out of keeping with Elkanah's character, or "a portion set in one's presence," that is, "an offered portion," which is jejune. In this failure of the strict rendering to make sense, it is perhaps better to conjecture a meaning "persons" for אַפַּיִם, (following Syr. and Arab.) and render "a double portion."—Tr.].

Vers. 6–8. *Hannah, provoked by her adversary, consoled by Elkanah. Peninnah* is Hannah's adversary on account of Elkanah's special love for the latter (ver. 5); out of jealousy she is her rival. Bigamy, which is in opposition to God's appointment, bears its bitter fruits for Elkanah and his house.—גַּם־כַּעַס "with anger (or vexation) *also*." כַּעַס is not simply "vexation" in a subjective-intransitive sense, but is found also in an objective-transitive sense, as in Deut. xxxii. 27 (the wrath which the enemy produces in me) and 2 Kings xxiii. 26 (כְּעָסִים, provocations to anger, in reference to God). This last is the sense here also, and the גַּם ("also") indicates the heaping up of anger and vexation which Peninnah occasioned in Hannah. In what sense and with what design Peninnah did this is shown by the following words (בַּעֲבוּר, *etc.*). The word (רָעַם) in Hiph. means "to rouse, excite, put in lively motion;" here, as the context (כִּי סָגַר י׳) shows, against God; she not only held up before her her unfruitfulness, itself reckoned a reproach, but represented it also as a punishment from God, or at least as a lack of God's favor.—In ver. 7 Elkanah cannot be taken as subject, as is done in the present pointing (יַעֲשֶׂה); for in the preceding independent sentence (ver. 6) Peninnah is the subject; still less, for the same reason, can the suffix in עֲלֹתָהּ (when *she* went up) according to this construction be referred to Hannah. In accordance with the tenor of the narrative it is better, with Luther, De Wette, Bunsen, Thenius, to read יֵעָשֶׂה and translate "and so it happened." [Others read not so well תַּעֲשֶׂה "and so she did."—Tr.]. The two כֵּן (so . . . so) correspond therefore in relation to Peninnah's conduct, not in relation to Elkanah's bearing towards Hannah, and Peninnah's provocation (Keil). "So it happened (in reference to Peninnah) *etc.*, thus she provoked her (Hannah)." The words "and she wept, *etc.*" (וַתִּבְכֶּה) are referred naturally to Hannah by a sudden change of subject, which is allowable only in this understanding of the subjects from "it happened" (יַעֲשֶׂה) on.—In ver. 8 *Elkanah's consoling address* is contrasted with Peninnah's provocations. After "Hannah" the Sept. adds: "and she said, "Here am I, my lord, and he said;" but we are not to suppose (with Thenius) that the corresponding Hebrew words have fallen out of the text, for this phrase, a very common one in the circumstantial accounts of speeches and conversations, is here clearly an insertion. The attempt to give a more fitting expression to Elkanah's feeling gives too subjective a character to this reading; and this feeling is sufficiently portrayed by the Masoretic text, in which the first three questions about the why or wherefore of her grief set it forth in a climax (weeping, not eating, grief of heart). The translation of the Sept. τί ἐστί σοι ὅτι ("what is to thee that") does not warrant us in taking (with Thenius) for the original text the corresponding Heb. (מַה־לָּךְ כִּי) instead of "why" (לָמָה), for, comparing it with *ivari* [why] for the second and third "why" of the Heb., it is easily explained as a freedom of the translator. Elkanah, by the reference to himself, "am I not better to thee than ten children?" will comfort his wife for her lack of children. This supposes that she feels herself united to him by the most cordial love. We here have a picture of deepest and

tenderest conjugal love. The number ten is merely a round number to express many.

II. *Hannah's Prayer for a Son.* Vers. 9–18 *a.*

1. First in vers. 9–11 an account is given of her *prayer and vow* before the Lord. The "eating and drinking" is the sacrificial meal of the whole family, at which Hannah was present, though out of sorrow she ate nothing, and at the conclusion of which she rose up in order to pray to the Lord. As it is expressly said, "she ate nothing," and Elkanah asks "why eatest thou not?" we must *not*, with Luther, translate "after she had eaten," on the groundless assumption that she had done so on Elkanah's consoling address (Von Gerlach). The Sept. renders rightly according to the sense μετὰ τὸ φαγεῖν αὐτούς [after they had eaten], though this does not justify us (Then.) in so reading the Heb. (אָכְלָם). The passage from *rose up* (וַתָּקָם) to *drunk* (שָׁתֹה on this Inf. Abs. for Inf. Con., see Ewald, § 339 *b*) is to be connected with *prayed*, ver. 10 (וַתִּתְפַּלֵּל) the latter expressing the act which followed her rising from the meal; the rest, from "Eli" to "soul" is parenthesis, which, in two circumstantial sentences, gives the ground and explanation of the following narrative. *Eli's sitting* at the entrance of the Sanctuary is specially mentioned because of his after conduct to the praying Hannah; *Hannah's bitterness of soul* is mentioned because it was the reason of her praying to the Lord. [The Heb. favors the translation, ver. 9, "after *she* had eaten ... and drunk;" it may be a mere general expression, or she may have yielded to her husband's request. There is no contradiction in this case between ver. 7 and ver. 9. See *Bib. Comm. in loco.*—Tr.].

In distinction from his sons, who are called "priests of the (to the) Lord" (כֹּהֲנִים לַיהוָה), Eli is called *the* priest (הַכֹּהֵן). Though called simply "the priest," he yet filled the office of High-Priest (Aaron and Eleazar, his son, are so called Num. xxvi. 1; xxvii. 2). In the beginning of the period of the Judges Phinehas, son of Eleazar, was High-Priest, Judg. xx. 28. This office was bestowed not only on him, but also on his posterity, Num. xxv. 13. At the end of the period of the Judges it is in the possession of Eli, who, however, was a descendant, not of Eleazar and Phinehas, but of Ithamar, Aaron's fourth son. In 1 Sam. ii. 28 the continued existence of the High-priesthood from its institution to Eli is taken for granted, and is confirmed by Jewish tradition (Josephus, Ant. V. 11, § 5). According to this the High-priesthood continued to exist indeed in the period of the Judges, but did not remain, in accordance with the promise in Num. xxv., with "the seed of Phinehas," but passed over to the family of Ithamar. It is not our author's purpose to tell anything of the history of the High-priests and Judges. What he relates in the beginning of his Book of Eli and his sons serves only to illustrate the history and importance of Samuel's call, and to show that it was a historical necessity that the reformation of religious-moral life should be undertaken by the Prophetic Order which entered with Samuel as a new and mighty factor into the development of the Theocracy over against the corrupted priesthood.—The door-post (מְזוּזָה), at which Eli sat, hardly accords with the curtain which formed the entrance to the Holy Place, except on the supposition that, after the Sanctuary was permanently fixed in Shiloh, a solid entrance-way, perhaps of stone, with doors, was built; this is favored by iii. 15, where the "doors" are presupposed by the door-post here. הֵיכַל יְהוָה is the Tabernacle in relation to God as King of Israel; it is his "palace" where, in His royal majesty as "King of glory" (Ps. xxiv.), He dwells in the midst of His people, meets with them, and holds with them covenant-communion (Ex. xxv. 8; xxix. 45, 46).—Hannah was "in bitterness of soul" (מָרַת נָפֶשׁ) at the continuance of her hopelessness, and the vexations which she suffered from her adversary (comp. 2 Kings iv. 27).—Her supplication was the outpouring of her troubled soul before the Lord, and the words of the prayer (that her request for a son might be heard) were accompanied with many tears (וּבָכֹה תִבְכֶּה); that was the expression of her grief because her petitions had been hitherto unheard.

Ver. 11. **And she vowed a vow** is, as it were, the superscription and theme of the following words, which form a vow-prayer. The word here used (נֶדֶר) usually means the *positive* vow (Num. vi. 2–5 is an exception), the promise to return fitting thanks to the Lord, in case the petition is granted, by something performed for His honor or by an offering (the first ex. is in Gen. xxviii. 20–22); the *negative* vow, the promise to refrain from something, is אֱסָר or אִסָּר=obligatio (Num. xxx. 3). The former is connected with the Shelamim, as here Hannah's vow with Elkanah's peace-offering. [For the law of vows in the case of married women, see Num. xxx. 6–16.—*Bib. Comm. in loco.*—Tr.]—Hannah addresses Jehovah Sabaoth in view of His all-controlling power, by virtue of which He *can* put an end to her disgrace. The "if" (אִם) denotes not doubt, but the certainty of the fact, that, *etc.* The three-fold expression: "if thou wilt *look* on the affliction of thine handmaid, and *remember* me, and not *forget*," betokens in the clearest manner her confidence that God cares for her, has fixed His eyes on her person and her troubles, and characterizes the *fervor* and energy of her believing prayers. The thrice-repeated "thy *handmaid*" expresses the deep *humility* and resignation with which she brings her petition to the Lord. The *object* of her *petition* is male seed, a son. (אֲנָשִׁים, plural of אִישׁ, comp. Ewald, § 186 f.)—[The Sept. has ἐπιβλέψῃς ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης σου, which are the identical words of the *Magnificat. He hath regarded the low estate of his handmaiden* (Luke i. 48). *Bib. Comm. in loco.*—Tr.]—The *vow* (then I will give him, *etc.*) has two parts: 1) the consecration of the son all the days of his life to the Lord; she will give him to the Lord for His own, that he may serve the Lord all his life in the Sanctuary.* The emphasis is on

* [This local service promised by the mother was afterwards interrupted, chiefly by the call of Samuel to higher duties as prophet. To the mother the Sanc-

the words "all the days" (כָּל־יְמֵי חַי): the son was already called and pledged as Levite to service in the sanctuary, but not till his thirtieth or twenty-fifth year, and then to periodical service; Hannah consecrates him to the Lord all the days of his life, that is, to a life-long and constant service in the sanctuary. But this is entirely independent of the second part of the vow. 2) "No razor shall come upon his head," that is, he shall be a Nazir (נָזִיר), one set apart to the Lord. The nazirate (nazariteship), as we see it in its representatives in the time of the Judges, Samson and Samuel, belonged to the holy institutions with which special consecration to God was connected. The Nazarite-vow belonged to the negative or abstinence-vows. According to the legal prescriptions in Num. vi. 1 sq. (which indeed presuppose the nazirate as a *custom*, and only regulate it, and affirm its importance), the characteristic marks of the Nazarite were the refraining from wine and all intoxicating drinks, letting the hair grow, and avoiding defilement by corpses even of the nearest kin. The one controlling ethical principle in these three negative prescriptions is expressed in vers. 2, 5, 8: the separation or abstinence is *for the Lord;* the Nazir is holy to Jehovah (קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוה). To the negative element answers the positive—the special devotion and consecration of person and life to the Lord. This shows itself 1) in the abstinence from intoxicating drinks, which betokens the maintenance of complete clearness of mind for the Lord in the avoidance of sensual indulgences which destroy or hinder communion with God; 2) in avoiding contact with the dead, which sets forth the preservation of purity of life against all moral defilement, and its complete devotion to the *living* God, and 3) in keeping the razor from the free-growing hair, which indicates the refraining from intercourse with the world, and the consecration of the whole strength and the fulness of life, whose symbol is the free growth of hair as the ornament* (נֵזֶר of the Lord, ver. 7) of the head. It is in keeping with the great importance which is attached (in ver. 7) to the hair of the Nazarite as "consecration (נֵזֶר) of his God upon his head," that here this mark alone is mentioned, and Hannah thereby distinguishes her desired son as one vowed to God, see Num. vi. 11. Comp. Oehler in Herzog's *R.-E. s. v.* Nasiräat. [A similar omission occurs in the case of Samson, Judg. xiii. 5, who is, however, called a Nazarite. It may, perhaps, be doubtful whether all the conditions of the Nazirate were observed in these cases. Comp. the fuller statement concerning John the Baptist, Luke i. 15. The Sept. inserts "And he shall drink neither wine nor strong drink," plainly an addition to bring it into exacter accordance with the law in Num. vi. It is possible that some freedom was used in making the vow, as the time was left at the option of the consecrator. Samuel was what the Talmud calls נזיר עולם, "a perpetual Nazarite."—The preservation of the hair does not seem to symbolize withdrawal from the world; and in fact the Nazarite did not lead a secluded life. The view of Oehler, adopted above by Erdmann, that the hair represents vigor and life, is perhaps supported by the connection between the hair and strength in Samson's case. Another view, that it symbolizes the subjection of man to God, is adopted by Baumgarten and Fairbairn; the latter refers to Paul's teaching in 1 Cor. xi. 10. On the general subject see Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, Fairbairn's *Typology* II. 346.—Tr.]—The nazirate is in its essential elements related to the priesthood, and represents the idea of a truly priestly life withdrawn from earthly-worldly things and devoted to God. But it has nothing in common with the priestly order as such; it was, along with that, a special temporary form of consecration to the Lord in opposition to the unholy, impure life of the world. The Nazarites were not bound to service in the sanctuary, and not all who were called to this service were Nazarites. The son whom Hannah had consecrated by her first vow to life-long service in the sanctuary she consecrated by her second to be a Nazarite for life. The latter was the condition and foundation of an all the more hearty and faithful devotion to the Lord in His sanctuary-service. The life-long nazirate, to which children could be devoted before birth, as was true here and with Samson (comp. John the Baptist), was the highest and most comprehensive presentation of that idea. This double vow of Hannah and its fulfillment gave to Samuel from childhood on the disposition of heart and direction of life towards the Lord, in which all the powers of his mind, all the striving and struggling of his inner and outer life were consecrated for the performance of the holy mission which he had received from the Lord.

2. Vers. 12, 13. *Eli's profane view* of the condition of the praying Hannah. Her *manner of praying* is very distinctly described: 1) she prayed much and long, before the Lord—this marks the energy of thorough devotion and ardent piety towards God; 2) she spake to her heart (עַל is not "in," nor is it=אֶל, Gen. xxiv. 25, where there is a similar phrase); in her prayer Hannah looked altogether into her heart, that she might obtain consolation and rest for it, and thus it was certainly in fact speaking *in* her heart. This marks the deep sincerity of heart, the profound concentration and emotion of soul with which she prayed; it was so intense that only her lips moved as the involuntary expression of her emotion, and her voice was not heard, which was the necessary result of the fact that her heart was turned in on itself and thoroughly immersed in God.—In contrast with this picture of the believing suppliant, *Eli's conduct* is portrayed as really profane; his view of Hannah's condition is precisely the opposite of the truth. He appears here as a very *bad Judge*. He judges merely from the *outward appearance;* he looks only at the movement of her lips (פִּיהָ), which from the Heb. expression (נָעוֹת) must have been lively; he remains fixed at the *surface*, while, consider-

tuary-service seemed the best pursuit of life; but God had something better for the son. Yet Hannah's devout spiritual *purpose* is maintained in her son's life. —Tr.]

* [This word נזר in Num. vi. 7 means "consecration," not "crown," or "ornament." The root (Arab. *nadhara*) means to "set," "impose," and thus is applied to setting apart the Nasir, or to setting a crown on the head of a priest or king.—Tr.]

ing the source of Hannah's emotion, he ought to have seen the prayerful energy of her heart through the outward appearance; he passes *rash* judgment on her, holding her from the signs of her emotion to be a *drunken* woman; instead of "making the best" of what seemed to him strange, he *suspiciously* takes it in the worst sense, for he must have seen that Hannah came to pray, and was really praying, and need not have thought of drunkenness to explain her demeanor. There is a noteworthy irony in the fact that, while the High-priest takes her to be drunk, she has made a vow for her son which looks to the very opposite. This conduct is characteristic of Eli. With all his piety and good nature, he was lacking religiously and morally in proper earnestness and true depth and thoroughness. To the same source, his natural-fleshly disposition of heart, whence came his conduct towards his unworthy sons, we must refer his profane conduct and his so false judgment on the praying Hannah. Yet there was some ground for his hasty suspicion of Hannah in the frequent occurrence of such cases in connection with the sacrificial meals; and this points to a certain externalized and brutalized condition of the religious-moral life in the very precincts of the sanctuary under a brutalized priesthood. "Such heartfelt prayer seems not to have been usual at that time" (Bunsen).

3. Vers. 14–18 *a. Hannah's conversation with Eli concerning her prayer* shows again the striking contrast between Eli's pre-judgment of her condition and her real frame of heart (vers. 14, 15), and Hannah's deep heart-felt piety as the source of her supplication (vers. 15, 16), but brings out also Eli's better nature, the expression of which is the wish for a blessing (vers. 17, 18).

Ver. 14. Eli sat at the door-post of the sanctuary no doubt to keep watch and prevent all things improper; but his address to Hannah shows how unworthily he did it. The *question* "How long wilt thou be drunken?" must have wounded her heart all the more in the sorrowful mood of her prayer, and grieved her no less deeply than Peninnah's speech. (On the form תִּשְׁתַּכָּרִין see Ewald, § 191, and Gesen., § 47, 3). The *order:* "put away thy wine from thee," that is, "take steps to get sober again," or "go and sleep off thy debauch" (comp. xxv. 37), is as rude and profane as the question—least of all becoming to, and to be expected from, a priest. Here, looking at Eli's sons, we cannot but think of the German proverb: "The apple falls close to the tree."* It is the same unworthy littleness that we see in Acts ii. 13 ("they are full of new wine"). The Sept. has here in Eli's interests inserted "youth, servant" (נַעַר) before "Eli," and put the rudeness off on him; but then his dismissal must have been mentioned here, and Hannah could not have answered the servant: "no, my *lord*," which words are addressed to Eli (comp. Böttch. against Thenius). To Thenius' remark that the masoretic recension has here for unknown reasons abridged, we reply that *such* abridgement, which sets Eli in so bad a light, certainly cannot be regarded as probable. In reference to the "servant" of the Septuagint, the canon of criticism holds that the harder, more offensive reading is to be preferred.

Ver. 15 sq. *Hannah's answer* is an energetic denial of Eli's charge; in the spirited fulness of her reply, we may see something of the indignation which Eli's unworthy speech had called forth in her heart. Her language is in part a denial of his assumption, in part an explanation of her condition of mind as the reason of her conduct in prayer; each of these parts has a three-fold expression, so that each denial answers to an explanation. First, she denies simply and sharply with "no, my lord" (לֹא אֲדֹנִי) the *drunkenness* imputed to her, and explains that her condition of soul is one of *deep sorrow*. According to the masoretic text Hannah says: "I am hard of spirit" (קְשַׁת רוּחַ). Though in Ezek. iii. 7 the similar phrase "hard of heart" (קְשֵׁה לֵב) means "obstinate," "stiff-necked," yet the combination of this Adj. (קשה) in the signification "heavy" (Judg. iv. 24 [the hand . . . was heavy against Jabin]; Ex. xviii. 26) with the subst. (רוּחַ= disposition, mind, Gen. xli. 8; Ps. xxxiv. 19 [18]) may give the signification "*heavy-hearted.*" It is not clear why it should sound strange (as Thenius thinks) that Hannah, in her condition, should speak of herself as heavy-hearted; the expression is so natural in reply to Eli's outspoken suspicion, that she had dulled her mind with intoxicating drink. Hence, also, follows immediately the express denial of this suspicion. The Sept., on the other hand, has the strange expression: *γυνὴ ἐν σκληρᾷ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγώ εἰμι* (I am a woman in a hard day). This is based on the reading "hard of day" (קְשַׁת יוֹם), an expression which in Job xxx. 25 ["in trouble"] describes one who has a hard day, a hard life, is unhappy. So the Vulg.: *infelix nimis ego sum,* "I am very unfortunate." Perhaps this is the original reading, as Thenius supposes. Clericus: "This reading is not to be wholly despised."—The negation advances from the simple "no, my lord," to the denial that there is anything in her case to produce drunkenness, that is, that she has drunk wine or any intoxicating drink (שֵׁכָר); with this denial she connects, so as to bring out a sharp contrast, the explanation and assurance that she has "poured out her soul before the Lord." Comp. Ps. xlii. 5 [4]: I *pour out* my soul in me; Ps. lxii. 9 [8]: *Pour out* your heart before him; and Ps. cxlii. 3 [2]: "I pour out my complaint before him." This expression, common in German [and English] also and Latin (*fundere preces*), indicates the lightening of the deeply moved, sorrowful heart by complaints, petitions, *etc.*, before God the Lord, based on humble submission to His will and trust in His help, that is, on the opposite of the feeling which Peninnah wished to excite in Hannah (ver. 6). Comp. Calvin on Ps. cxlii. 3: "He sets the pouring out one's thoughts and telling one's trouble over against the confused anxieties which unhappy men nurse in their hearts, preferring to gnaw the bit rather than flee to God." Such pouring out of the heart before the Lord witnesses for Hannah of itself against Eli's charge of intemperance and drunkenness.—A third and still stronger denial she

* [Equivalent to the Eng.: "Like father, like son."—Tr.]

makes (ver. 16); and this time it refers to the bad, worthless character which he had imputed to her. "Daughter of worthlessness" (on the etymology of בְּלִיַּעַל, comp. Gesen. *s. v.*)=bad woman. The words "count not," *etc.* (אַל־תִּתֵּן, *etc.*). cannot be explained: "Do not make me the scorn of bad women" (Clericus), but must be rendered: "Do not in thought set thy handmaiden *before* (לִפְנֵי) a worthless woman," that is, let not thy handmaid be taken for a worthless woman, do not liken her to such a one. She grounds her denial of this bad opinion of her on the assurance, which answers to the two positive explanations, and forms their conclusion, that out of the *abundance* (רֹב) of her complaint and grief she had spoken "hitherto" (עַד־הֵנָּה), that is, as long as Eli had observed her.—Comp. Calvin *ad h. l.*: "Consider the modesty of Hannah, who, though she suffered injury from the High-priest, yet answers with reverence and humility."

Ver. 17. *Eli's reply.* Eli, as Calvin remarks, "not only insulted a feeble woman, but blasphemed against God Himself, though unintentionally." Now he retracts his accusation; indeed, he really, though silently, accuses himself of injustice to Hannah, in that 1) he replies with the usual parting-formula "Go in peace!" and 2) he adds the wish that her request may be granted. (שֵׁלָתֵךְ is for שְׁאֵלָתֵךְ). There is no prophecy in this; it was a wish which God fulfilled.—Ver. 18. *Hannah's answer* does not ask for his mediation (Keil), but is a respectful request that the High-priest would further grant her his favor, as he had already done (comp. ver. 26).—[There seems to be no advantage in closing this section in the middle of ver. 18. The latter part of the verse forms a fitting conclusion to the interview of Eli and Hannah, since it describes the result to Hannah of her prayer and conversation, and ver. 19 begins a new narrative, as in Eng. A. V. —Tr.]

III. *The Answer to the Prayer.* Vers. 18 *b*–20.

Hannah went her "way," namely, back to her husband. The words of the Sept.: "and she went to her inn," and (after "she did eat") "with her husband and drank," are explanatory and descriptive additions to the original text; it is inconceivable why these words, if they stood in the text originally, should have been left out. [The words "and did eat" are wanting in the Syriac and Arabic versions and in five MSS. of Kennicott, and were omitted perhaps because supposed to be inappropriate; but they fitly describe Hannah's more cheerful mood.—Tr.] "*And her countenance was no more to her*"—that is, her countenance was no longer disturbed as before. There are similar expressions in German. Comp. Job ix. 27, where, from the context, the word "countenance" (פָּנִים) is likewise to be taken in the sense "sad countenance" ["heaviness" in Eng. A. V.—Tr.].*

* [So the Vss. Chald. "bad countenance;" Syriac "disturbed count.;" Vulg. "*in diversa mutati;*" Arab. "changed on account of the reproach of her rival;" Sept. "her countenance no longer fell."—Tr.]

Ver. 19 describes circumstantially and vividly, almost solemnly, the *return* to Ramah after early worship together before the Lord. Elkanah *knew* his wife (יָדַע, "know," as in Gen. iv. 7). "The Lord *remembered* her," indicates the fulfilment of her request; the divine control, under which (ver. 11) she had placed herself, is quite appropriately here again expressly mentioned. At the end of the verse the Sept. (Alex.) adds "and she conceived," explaining and filling out the "remembered." There is no necessity for supposing (with Thenius, following the Sept.) that this expression has fallen out of the original text, where it was a needful explanation of the "remembered," since in the following ver. 20 the significance of the latter is expressed, though it cannot be considered a mere addition. [The change in the text of the Sept. (in the Vat., not Al.) is easily explained. The Heb. (ver. 20) reads "and in the course of time Hannah conceived and bare a son." The Greek translator stumbled at the place assigned the conceiving, and therefore changed the word from after to before the "course of time." The difficulty is removed when we remember that "conceived and bare" was the common phrase to express the birth of a child. The other versions sustain the Heb. order of words.—Some Heb. MSS. read "in the course of a year" (so De Wette), or, as some translate, "at the beginning of the new year" (in the autumn, Feast of Tabernacles), but there is no authority for this.—Abarbanel: "At the end of a month."—Tr.].—Ver. 20. "Up to the circuit or conclusion of the days or of the regular time"—that is, not "in the space of a year," but "at the conclusion of the period of pregnancy" (Thenius), at the end of the time necessary for what is afterwards said.—"She bare a son, whom she called *Samuel*." Hannah herself gives the explanation of this name, not etymological but factual, "I asked him from the Lord." (On the form שְׁאִלְתִּיו see Gesen. 44, 2, Rem. 2.) According to this explanation the name שְׁמוּאֵל (which belongs to two other persons only, Numb. xxxiv. 21; 1 Chr. vii. 2) is formed by contraction from שְׁמוּעַ אֵל, the ע falling out (Ewald, *Gr.* § 275, A. 3). The Rabbinical derivation from שָׁאוּל מֵאֵל, whence שְׁאוּמְאֵל and שְׁמוּאֵל is far-fetched and improbable. [That is, "asked of God"]. The name signifies literally "heard of God," *auditus Dei.* For Samuel was for his mother the sign of a special answer to prayer. Similar names of children, suggested by their mothers' experiences at their birth, are found elsewhere, for example, in Jacob's children (Gen. xxix. 32 sq.; xxx. 5 sq.).—The omission of "and she said" is original; the Sept. has clearly again here filled out and explained (against Thenius). Hannah's saying, introduced without this addition, is thereby characterized as an explanation, historically handed down, of this name in reference to what preceded Samuel's birth. [This whole incident is discussed in the Talmudical Tract "*Berakoth*," fol. 31 *b*, but the discussion offers nothing of special value.—Tr.].

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.*

[This is the appropriate place to introduce a brief statement of the *chronological* relation between the latter part of "Judges" (end of chap. xvi.) and the beginning of "Samuel." We shall not attempt to discuss the various schemes of the chronology which have been presented by different writers, but merely give the biblical data for determining the chronological relations of Samson, Eli, and Samuel. The first datum is given in 1 Kings vi. 1, and, putting the fourth year of Solomon B. C. 1012, fixes the Exodus in B. C. 1492, the entrance into Canaan B. C. 1452, while David's accession falls B. C. 1056. The second datum is found in Jephthah's statement, Judg. xi. 26, according to which the beginning of his judgeship falls 300 years after the entrance into Canaan, that is, B. C. 1152. From this time to the death of Abdon (Judg. xii. 7-15) is thirty-one years, and Abdon's death is to be put B. C. 1121. We have thus between the death of Abdon and the accession of David a space of sixty-five years in which to put Samson, Eli, Samuel, and Saul. It is clear that their histories must be in part contemporaneous. Eli dies an old man, while Samuel is yet a youth, and Samuel is an old man when Saul is anointed king. The following table may give approximately the periods of these men:

Samson's Judgeship,	B. C.	1120–1100
Eli's Life (98 years)	"	1208–1110
Eli's Judgeship (40 years)	"	1150–1110
Samuel's Life	"	1120 (or 1130)–1060
Saul's Reign	"	1076–1056

According to this view the judgeships of Samson and Eli were in part contemporaneous, and Samuel was twenty (or thirty) years old when Samson died, the work of the latter being confined to the west and south-west, while Samuel lived chiefly in the centre of the land. The forty years of Philistine oppression (Judg. xiii. 1) would then be reckoned B. C. 1120–1080, reaching nearly up to Saul's accession, and the third battle of Ebenezer would fall in B. C. 1080 when Samuel was forty years old. Hannah's visit to Shiloh occurred about (or, a little before) the time that Samson began to vex the Philistines, but it is probable that the hostilities were confined to the territories of Judah and Dan. Partly for this reason, and partly because the history has been given already in the Book of Judges, our author does not mention Samson, whose life had no point of contact with that of Samuel, who is the theocratic-prophetical centre of the Books of Samuel. On the general subject see Herzog, *Art. "Zeitrechnung (biblische")*, Smith's *Dict. of Bible, Art. "Chronology," Comm. on Judges* in Lange's *Bible-work*, and Smith's *Old Testament Hist.*, chap. 17, Note (A) and ch. 19, Note (A). But it is doubtful whether we have sufficient data at present for settling the question.—Tr.].

1. The beginning of the Book of Samuel coincides with a principal turning-point in the history of the kingdom of God in Israel, introducing us into the end of the Period of the Judges, which is to be included with the Mosaic under one point of view, namely, that of the establishment of the Theocracy on its objective foundations. The Mosaic Period of the development of the Israelitish religion—which is based on God's revelation in the Patriarchal Period in order to the choice of the one people as the bearer of the Theocracy, first in germinal form in the family, and then in its first national development in Egypt—shows us the firm establishment of the Divine Rule, which embraced and shaped the whole life of the people, on the theocratic *law-covenant*, and on the word of the divine *promise*. The establishment of the Rule of God in *His* people, in their outer and inner life, in all things great and small, by means of the *institution of the Law*, in which His holy will is the norm for the people's life, is the aim of the whole revelation of God in the Mosaic Period, as it appears in commandments, statutes, holy institutions, and legal principles. The land in which this God-rule in the chosen people was to reach historical form and development, was the object of the *promises* in the Patriarchal Period, and the period of Joshua and the Judges shows how this promise was fulfilled in the acquisition and division of the land. What sudden changes, from complete defeats to glorious victories in battle against the heathen peoples in and out of the land of promise, from divine deliverances to apparently complete abandonment by God, as a consequence of the vacillation of the people between idolatrous apostasy from the living God, and return to His help forced on them by need and misery, are exhibited in the history of the post-Mosaic times! But through all the gloom shines out continually the goal, the fulfilment of the *promise* of the complete possession of the land; and in the midst of the people's sin and misery the Theocracy stands fast unshaken, with its Mosaic law controlling the popular life, and all its great objective institutions which, even in times of most wretched disorder, marked Israel as the chosen people of the living God. The Mosaic period of development of the Theocracy in Israel up to the end of the period of the Judges is therefore the time of its establishment in the chosen people by the institution of the covenant of the law and the geographical-historical realization of the idea of the Theocracy in the permanently acquired land of promise.

But now came the task of bringing the people, they being at rest and permanently fixed in Canaan, face to face with their theocratic destination and their calling (Ex. xix. 6) in their whole inner and outer life. The content of the revelations, which had produced the covenant of the law and the fulfilling of the promise in the Mosaic Period, was to be inwardly appropriated and become the life of the people in knowledge, heart and will. For this there was needed on God's side the progressive realization and announcement of His counsel of revelation; and on man's side there was the unceasing obligation to penetrate with the whole inner life, with understanding and feeling, with mind and will, into God's revelation in law and promise, and appropriate inwardly its content. This task—the

* [The German is "*Reichsgeschichtliche und biblisch-theologische Ausführungen*," literally "theocratic-historical and biblical-theological developments (or comments")—Tr.].

deep, inward implanting of the revelation of God in law and promise in the heart and feeling of individuals and in the life of the whole nation—could be fulfilled neither by the *judges*, the lives of some of whom corresponded poorly to their theocratic calling, nor by the *priesthood*, which showed its fall from its original theocratic elevation in the transition from the family of Eleazar to that of Ithamar and in the house of Eli, nor by the mere existence and use of the objective theocratic-historical *institutions*, national sanctuary, feasts, offerings. This impossibility is vividly set before us in the beginning of the Books of Samuel. But we are there at the same time pointed to the new element in the development of the Theocracy, the *prophetic office*, which was to be the instrument of fulfilling this task, and of realizing the idea of mediation between God and His people through their living permeation by* His objective revelation of word and promise; so Moses, as type of prophecy, represented it. The turning-point from the Mosaic to the prophetic period of development of the Theocracy falls in the beginning of the Books of Samuel; that is, in the first years of Samuel's life. (Comp. Oehler, *Prolegom. zur Theol. des A. T.*, 1845, pp. 87, 88; and W. Hoffmann, *Die göttliche Stufenordnung im A. T.* in Schneider's *Deutsche Zeitschrift*, 1854, *Nr.* 7, 8.) From Samuel's time Peter (Acts iii. 24) dates the prophetic office; from then on the prophets, devoted to the service of the Theocracy, form a separate Order, and, as organs of God's revelations to His people, a continuous chain. (See Tholuck, *Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen*, 2 ed. 1861, p. 26.)

2. The end of the Period of the Judges, like its previous history, reveals a deep *disorder* of the *theocratic* life, which neither judges nor priests could help, because they were themselves affected by its corrupting influences, as is shown by the histories of Samson and Eli. The unimportance and weakness to which the Judgeship was fallen may be inferred from its connection with the High-priesthood in the person of Eli, the latter office having evidently passed from Phinehas' family to Ithamar's, contrary to the promise in Num. xxv. 11–13, because the condition of "zeal for the Lord" was not fulfilled. And the conduct of Eli and his sons, and especially God's judgment against his house, show how badly the High-priesthood was represented in him. The political life of the nation was crushed under the constant oppression of external enemies, the heathen nations on the east, and especially the Philistines on the west, and under internal national distraction; the tribes were at enmity with one another, did not unite against foreign foes, and could gather together "as one man" only against one of themselves (Benjamin), and that was the last time (Judg. xix.–xxi.).† And though individual men, called of the Lord to be deliverers, exerted a mighty influence on the distracted national life, yet their influence was restricted to particular tribes, and was not permanent—was always followed by a sinking back into the old wretched condition. The cause of this was the *deterioration of religious life*, which was wide-spread among the people; the worship of the living Covenant-God was mingled with the nature-worship of the Canaanitish nations, not all of whom were completely conquered, and especially with the Baal-worship of the Philistines; or it was suppressed by these heathen worships. Gideon's ephod-worship (Judg. viii. 27) and Micah's image-worship (Judg. xvii., xviii.) belonged also to this corruption of the religion of Jehovah. With this moral decline and distraction of theocratic life was connected *corruption of moral life*, such as we see in some parts of Samson's history (he succumbs morally, as well as physically, to the Philistines), in the crime of the Benjamites (Judg. xix.), which calls forth all the rest of the nation against them in stubborn, bloody war, and in the unworthy character of the sons of Eli, who disgrace the sanctuary itself with their wickedness. The whole popular life had fallen into an anarchy in which "every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Judg. xxi. 25).

3. The necessity for a *reformation of the whole national life* from within outward, that is, a renewal of the whole Theocracy on a religious-moral basis meets us at the beginning of the Books of Samuel. The holy institutions, the ordinances of divine worship, and the theocratic legislation of the Mosaic Period are present indeed in the time of the Judges (comp. the exegetical explanations). The people had their national central sanctuary in Shiloh as sign of God's abode among His people, celebrated their festivals, and brought their offerings there. The priestly service in the sanctuary was arranged; the nazirate and the institution of holy women* in connection with the sanctuary were the special forms of consecration of life to Jehovah's service. It is a false view to regard the time of the Judges as a period of fermentation, out of which first arose fixed legal institutions and appointments. Rather the whole Mosaic legislation and the history of the establishment of the Theocracy on the basis of the covenant of law is in many places presupposed in the Book of Judges and in the beginning of the Books of Samuel themselves (comp. Hengst., *Beitr.* III. 40 sq. [Eng. transl., "Contributions to an Introd. to the Pentateuch," Clark, Edinb.]). But it is true (as is expressly stated in Judg. ii. 10 sq.), that in the religious-moral life of the people there was a general defection from the living God to strange gods. Though in particular circles and families (as Samuel's, for ex.) there was true service of God and piety, yet the national and political life of the distracted and shattered people was on the whole not in the least in keeping with its priestly calling. The gap between the people's religious-moral condition on the one hand, and the theocratic institutions and the demands of the divine law on the other was become so wide and deep, that a great reformer was needed, who, by special divine call and in the might of the Spirit of God, should turn the whole national life to the living God again, and make Him its unifying centre. To this need of a reformation of the Theocracy by new revelations of the covenant-God, and by the return of the covenant-people to communion with

* [Germ: *durch das Flüssigwerden seines objectiven Offenbarungswortes, etc.*—Tr.]

† [This civil war occurred, however, soon after Joshua, since Phinehas, grandson of Aaron, was then High-priest (Judg. xx. 28): whether there was afterwards a general national uprising, we do not know.—Tr.]

* [See note on 1 Sam. ii. 22.—Tr.]

their God answered the special divine working by which the prophetic office, instead of the priesthood, was united with the true theocratic Judgeship in the mighty God-filled personality of Samuel.

4. The special divine working shows itself in the providential plan by which God chose and prepared the great instrument for leading His people into the path, in which they were to find their holy calling and merge their whole life in the divine rule and communion. The reformer of the Theocracy, the second Moses, sprang from a thoroughly pious family, faithful and obedient to the law of the Lord. In its very commencement his life is specially consecrated by the hearing which God vouchsafed to the prayer of his pious mother for a son. In the same Tribe, whence came the saviour of the people from the bondage of Egypt and the founder of the Theocracy through God's wonderful working, and which by divine appointment represented the whole people in the Sanctuary-service, was born the man of God, who in the highest sense as Prophet of the Lord, was all his life to do priestly service in renewing the theocratic life, and restore it from its alienation from the living God to communion with Him. Specially also it was the energy and earnestness of his mother's piety which from the first gave to this great man's life the direction and determination by which he became God's instrument for the regeneration of His people. Hannah, in devoting her child to the perpetual service of the Lord (thus giving Him back what her prayer had obtained from Him), did unconsciously and silently, under the guidance of the Spirit of the Lord, a holy deed, which, taken into the plan of the divine wisdom, was the beginning of that series of great God-deeds by which, through this chosen instrument, a new turn of world-historical importance was given to the history of Israel. The *name* which she gives her son marks him out for the people as an immediate gift of God, through which, as Calvin says, "God in His mercy ordained a *reformation* of His worship in the people."

5. In Samuel's early life we see again the *importance* (*even for the Kingdom of God*) *of the theocracy of a truly pious family-life in the Old Dispensation*. There were still in Israel houses and families in which the children (who, according to the Law, were not usually carried to the great feasts celebrated at the Sanctuary), were introduced to the public religious life, and accustomed to the religious service of the people; and this is a sign that, in spite of the desolation of the theocratic life and the degradation of the religious-moral life, there still lay hidden in domestic life a sound germ of true piety and fear of God. From this uncorrupted vigorous germ which appears religiously in the earnest life of prayer of the parents, and ethically in their tender, considerate conjugal love, Samuel's life sprouts forth as a plant consecrated from its root directly to the Lord's special service.

6. Thus the religious-moral life was not so far gone that it could not, by God's power, produce from the narrow circle of the house and family such a person as Samuel; nor, in spite of the general depravation and disruption of the theocratic-national life, was it impossible for Samuel, as God's instrument sprung from this soil, to find positive points of connection and a responsive receptivity for his work of reform as Judge and Prophet. The spirit which gave shape to his childhood and youth from the first moments of his life, had shown itself, sporadically it is true, yet living and powerful in individual facts in the time of the Judges (comp. Deborah's Song, Judg. v.; Gideon's word "Jehovah shall rule over you," Judg. viii. 23; and especially the energetic reaction of the theocratic seal of the whole people against the Tribe of Benjamin, who, contrary to the command "be ye holy," had refused to deliver up the offenders, by whose execution evil was to be put away out of the midst of Israel, Judg. xx.) The prophetic reformer, called by God out of the domain of a deeply pious *family-life*, found in that theocratical spirit, which was concealed under the general corruption, the receptive ground on which he could plant himself in order to gather the whole people about the living God and His word, and press His revelations into their very heart and soul.

7. The divine name *Jehovah Sabaoth* (יהוה צְבָאוֹת), which does not occur in the Pentateuch or in the Books of Joshua and Judges, is found here for the first time, and seems to have come into general use particularly in the time of Samuel and David (comp. 1 Sam. xv. 2, xvii. 45; 2 Sam. vii. 8, 26 sq.; Ps. xxiv. 10). It seldom occurs in the Books of Kings, is found most frequently in the Prophets, except Ezekiel and Daniel, and never in Job, Proverbs, the later Psalms and the post-exilian historical books, except in Chronicles in the history of David, where it is to be referred to the original documents.—The word 'Sabaoth' is never found in the Old Test. alone. The Sept. sometimes gives it as a proper name, Σαβαώθ, as here, where it has also the full form *κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ* (Lord God), which answers to the proper complete expression of this divine name, Jehovah God of Sabaoth (יהוה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת comp. Am. iii. 13; iv. 13; v. 14; or יאו הַצְּבָאוֹת), of which Jehovah Sabaoth is an abbreviation.*

The signification "God of war" (see Ex. vii. 4; xii. 41, where Israel is called "the hosts of Jehovah," צְבָאוֹת יְהוָֹה) cannot be regarded as the original sense of this expression, though the latter includes the glory of God manifested in His victorious power over His enemies. If this were the proper and original signification, it would be inexplicable why the name is wanting precisely in the histories of those wars and battles, which were Jehovah's own (Num. xxi. 14), though

* And as the combination אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת is not unfrequent (Ps. lix. 6; lxxx. 5, 8, 15, 20; lxxxiv. 9) and in the mas. text the יהוה, when אדני precedes, never has the points of אֲדֹנָי but always of אֱלֹהִים—and further as the word יהוה as a proper name cannot be construed with a Gen.—the combination יהוה צְבָאוֹת is not to be taken as stat. const., but as a breviloquence or ellipsis, the general notion "God" being supplied from the proper name Jehovah. So (against Gesenius and Ewald) Oehler in Herzog *s. v.*, Hengstenberg, *Christologie* I. 436 sq. [Eng. tr. I. 375] and Keil, *Comm.* 16 [Eng. trans. p. 19]. [See Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, Am. ed., Tsebaoth.—Tr.]

Israel is expressly called His "hosts." Appeal is made in support of this signification to passages like 1 Sam. xvii. 45 (God of the armies of Israel), and Ps. xxiv. 8-10, (Jehovah strong and mighty, mighty in battle); but as these phrases are attached to the name "Jehovah of Hosts," they show (as Hengstenberg, on Ps. xxiv., and Oehler, *ubi sup.* point out) that the latter means something different, that "Jehovah of Hosts" means something higher than "Israel's God of war." Its meaning must be derived from Gen. ii. 1, where צְבָאָם "the host of them" refers properly only to "heavens"—and only by zeugma to "earth" (Oehler). Comp. Ps. xxxiii. 6; Deut. iv. 19; Neh. ix. 6, where כָּל־צְבָאָם "all the host of them" refers exclusively to the heavens. "The *hosts* are always the *heavenly* hosts, not created things in general" (Hengstenberg). They are of two classes, however, the material, the stars, and the spiritual, the angels. In reference to the stars as the "host of heaven" (Ps. xxxiii. 6) and the "host of God," praise is rendered to God's power and government of the world, by which He controls these glorious objects (Isa. xl. 26; xlv. 13), against the Sabian worship of the stars as divine powers, and against the danger to which Israel was exposed of perversion to such star-worship. This danger became great enough in the Period of the Judges and in the beginning of the Kingly Period to make the supposition allowable that the expression, with the sense of opposition to idolatry, came into use at this time. In Isa. xxiv. 23 this meaning of Jehovah Sabaoth comes out unmistakably in the reference to God's creative power which is loftier than the splendor of the stars, and in the contrast between His worship and that of the stars. The reference of the name "God of hosts" in Ps. lxxxix. 8 sq. to the angels is equally certain. The angels are marshalled around Jehovah in heaven, awaiting His commands, ready to perform His will on earth, especially as His instruments for the execution of His will in grace and judgment, for the protection of His people, for the overthrow of His enemies (1 Kings xxii. 19 sq.; Job i. 2); they go along with God in the revelation of His judicial-kingly power and glory (Deut. xxxiii. 2; Ps. lxviii. 18); they form the Lord's heavenly battle-host (Gen. xxxii. 1, 2; Josh. v. 14 sq.; 2 Kings vi. 17). By the reference to the two hosts, of stars and angels, which represent the creation in its loftiest and most glorious aspect, this expression sets forth the living God in His majesty and omnipotence over the highest created powers, who are subject to His control and instruments of the exercise of His royal might and power in the world. But God's glory, in His majesty and power over the star-world, and in His lordship over the spirit-world which stands ready to do His bidding in the world, exhibits Him of necessity in His royal omnipotent control of the whole world; and so "Jehovah Sabaoth" means in several passages the almighty controlling world-God, who has His throne in heaven, of whose glory the whole world is full, who "is called the God of the whole earth," who "buildeth His upper-chamber in heaven, and foundeth His arch on the earth." So Ps. xxiv. 8-10; Isa. vi. 3; liv. 5; Am. ix. 5, 6. In connection with the name "Jehovah" the expression indicates, with special reference to Israel, the almighty and victorious God, who overcomes the enemies of His people and His kingdom, who is the protection and help of His people against all the powers of the world.—The name occurs frequently in connection with wars and victories, in which God helps and protects His people against hostile powers; 1 Sam. xv. 2; xvii. 45; 2 Sam. vii. 8, 26 sq.; Ps. xxiv. 10; xlvi. 8, 12; lxxx. 8, 15; Isa. xxiv. 21-23; xxv. 4-6; xxxi. 4, 5. This name of God, Lord of Hosts, first appears in the beginning of the Books of Samuel, near the end of the Judges, and just before the kingdom was established, and occurs most frequently in the time of the Kings; and this fact has its deepest ground herein, that during this time God's royal power as almighty lord and ruler of the world and heavenly king of Israel first unfolded itself in all its fulness and glory—in victories over the enemies of His kingdom in Israel, in the almighty protection which He vouchsafed His people in the land of promise, and in the powerful aid which He gave them in establishing, fixing and extending the theocratic kingly power.*

8. A characteristic mark of Hannah's sincere piety is *the vow* (v. 11) which she makes to the Lord. The vow, from the Old Testament-point of view, is the solemn promise by which the pious man binds and pledges himself, in case his prayer is heard or his wish fulfilled, to show his thankfulness for the Lord's goodness by the performance of some special outward thing. Hence vows are almost always connected with petitions, though never as if they were the ground for God's fulfilment of the request. The positive vow (נֶדֶר), the promise of a special offering as a sign of gratitude, includes also the negative element of self-denial, so far as it is a relinquishment of one's own possessions, which are given to the Lord. This custom—namely, by a special promise making a particular act or mode of conduct a moral duty, and basing the obligation of performance not on the divine will, but on a vow made without divine direction—answers to the legal standpoint of the Old Testament and the moral minority founded on it. Forbearing to vow, was however, by no means regarded as sinful (Deut. xxii. 22); thus not only was the moral principle of voluntariness brought out, but the idea that the vow was in itself meritorious, was excluded. The vow, as a custom corresponding to moral weakness and consciousness of untrustworthiness in obedience to the Lord, is never legally commanded, nor even advised (comp. Prov. xx. 25; Ecc. v. 4, with Deut. xxiii. 22); but it is required that a vow made freely shall be fulfilled (Num. xxx. 3; Deut. xxiii. 21, 23; Ps. l. 14; Ecc. v. 3). But, as the hearing of a prayer is conditioned strictly on true piety, so, that a vow should be well-pleasing to the Lord, presupposes an humble, thankful soul which feels itself pledged and bound to the Lord, to devote everything to Him. The ethical idea of the vow finds its realization and fulfilment, as well as its clear and true apprehension, from the New Testament stand-point also in the vowing and dedicating to the Lord for life in

* [For a good exposition of "Jehovah Sabaoth," see Plumptre's "*Biblical Studies.*"—Tr.]

baptism the personality renewed by the Holy Ghost, (who in the Old Testament also is recognized and prayed for as the source of sanctification, Ps. li.). Hannah's vow is an analogue of Christian baptism in so far as it (the vow) consecrates the life of the child obtained by prayer wholly to the Lord for His property and for permanent service according to the stand-point of Old Testament piety, but this from the New Testament point of view comes to full truth only in the free spiritual devotion of the heart and the whole life to the Lord. [There is no warrant for introducing the lower Old Testament conception into an ordinance of the New Testament. Christian baptism, into the name of the Trinity, sets forth the free and full consecration of the believer to God, as Dr. Erdmann points out, and is no otherwise a vow, is never so spoken of in the New Testament.—Tr.].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.*

Ver. 2. Holy Scripture lets us see how not merely single sins in disposition, word and deed, but also general conditions and customs which spring from sin—such as polygamy—are the object of God's patience and long-suffering, and how there is in this no hindrance to the purposes of God's love and wisdom, but rather all such things are overruled by Him for good. [Hall: Ill customs, where they are once entertained, are not easily discharged: polygamy, besides carnal delight, might now plead age and example; so as even Elkanah, though a Levite, is tainted with the sin of Lamech, like as fashions of attire, which at the first were disliked as uncomely, yet, when they are once grown common, are taken up of the gravest. Yet this sin, as then current with the time, could not make Elkanah not religious.—Tr.]. Cramer: God distributes His gifts in a wonderful manner, to one He gives, the other He suffers to want, Gen. xxix. 31. Temporal gifts God gives not only to the worthy, but also to the unworthy, Matt. v. 45.—Ver. 3. Starke: *Worship* stands *first*, to show with what devoutness and reverence he makes his offering, and at the same time that praying is better than offering. [Comp. Cornelius: "Thy prayers and thine alms," Acts x. 4.—Tr.].—The offering was the deed which established the truthfulness of the praying word. Calvin: This subject-matter of adoration is to be referred to the three following heads: *first*, that when about to adore God we *recognise that we owe all things to Him*, and in *giving thanks for past blessings* we implore a still further *increase of His gifts*, and *help* in difficulties and perplexities; *secondly*, that *confessing our sins* as suppliant and guilty, we pray Him to grant us true *knowledge of our sins* and *repentance*, and to *have mercy* on us who pray for pardon; *thirdly* and finally, that *denying ourselves* and taking His yoke upon our shoulders, we profess ourselves ready to *render Him due obedience*, and to conform our affections to the rule of His law and to His will alone. [Ver. 4. The whole family take part in the feast of the peace-offerings. So as to the idol-worship in Jer. vii. 18, "The children gather wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead their dough, to make cakes to the queen of heaven." Both this passage and that, as to true religion and false, may impress upon us the importance of family worship and family religion. —Tr.].—Vers. 4–8. Elkanah's love to Hannah is a model of the true inner love with which husbands should not merely love their wives in general, but as regards their special troubles and sorrows, instead of being worried and vexed at them should rather feel these as their own, and with them bear in patience and gentleness whatever lies heavy upon their heart and weighs them down (ver. 5), and also protect them against provocations and vexations, which in an unrighteous and ill-disposed way are inflicted upon them (vers. 6, 7), and refresh them with consolation and encouragement (ver. 8).—[Ver. 5. Children were regarded as a blessing, by Hannah and the women of Israel in general (comp. Gen. xxx. 23; Luke i. 25), and the lack of them as a sad deprivation; and the correctness of this view is distinctly confirmed by the inspired writers, Ps. cxiii. 9; cxxvii. 3–5; cxxviii. 3. The contrary feeling which is now so rapidly growing in America is evil, both in its *causes* and in its *consequences*. The subject would require delicate handling in public discourse, but is exceedingly important.—Tr.]. When the Lord refuses us a gift which we are begging Him to grant, and the heart is full of mourning at the deprivation, then the temptation lies near to grumble about it against the Lord and quarrel with Him. This temptation comes partly from our own heart, which is a perverse and desponding thing, and will not reconcile itself to the dispensation of the Lord; partly it comes in upon us from without, through men who by their unloving conduct excite and embitter our hearts, and infuse into them the poison of discontent with those leadings of the Lord which contradict our desire and hope (vers. 6, 7).—In a devout marriage the love of the one party should not merely be to the other a fountain of consolation and of quieting as to painful dispensations of the Lord, but for whatever by the Lord's will is lacking in good fortune and joy it should seek to offer all the richer compensation (ver. 8).—Every violation of the holy ordering of God upon which marriage and the family life should rest, has as a necessary consequence—as is true of bigamy here—its punishment in the grievous disorder of conjugal and domestic life, in the destruction of peace in heart and home by all manner of sins, such as envy and jealousy.—Hannah makes no reply to the bad words of her adversary, and bears her hostility with patience.—Starke (ver. 7): A Christian must not requite evil with evil, railing with railing, but bear all patiently and hope in God; for His hand can change every thing (Ps. lxxvii. 11 [Eng. A. V. ver. 10. Luther translates it: "But I said, I must suffer that; the right hand of the most High can change everything," but this rendering is not authorized by the Hebrew.—Tr.]).—Ver. 8. Seb. Schmid: For the lack of one good, God knows how to compensate the pious by a greater and more manifest good.—J. Lange: As the marriage-bond is much closer than that between parents and children, it follows that husband and wife must hold each other nearer and dearer than all children. Each must help to bear the other's burdens, and seek to lighten them, Gal. vi. 2.

* [In the German literally "homiletical hints."—Tr.]

Vers. 1–8. *The priestly calling of the man in his house:* 1) in the close connection of his whole house with the service in the house of the Lord (prayer and offering); 2) in the nurture and admonition of the children for the Lord; 3) in expelling and keeping at a distance the evil spirit of unlovingness and dissension amid the members of the family; 4) in the constant exhibition of faithful, comforting, helping love towards his wife.—*A truly pious house* is that which 1) is at home in God's house, 2) diligently performs divine service in prayer and offering, in which 3) tender and true conjugal love dwells, and 4) the sufferings and deprivations imposed by the Lord are borne with patience and resignation.—*The preservation of genuine piety amid domestic troubles:* 1) in persevering prayer, when the Lord proves faith by not fulfilling particular wishes and hopes; 2) in enduring patience towards vexatious members of the family; 3) in consoling and supporting love towards members of the family who are easily assailed.—Vers. 9–14. *Amid vexations and assaults, what should impel us to prayer?* 1) The certainty that if men do us hurt, it does not occur without Divine permission. 2) The feeling that even the best human consolation cannot satisfy the heart which thirsts to be consoled. 3) Firm confidence in the help of the Lord, who in His faithfulness will help and in His power can help, when men will not help or cannot.—[Chrysostom: When standing to pray she did not remember her adversary, did not speak of her revilings, did not say, "Avenge me of this vile and wicked woman," as many women do; but not often remembering those reproaches, she prayed only for things profitable to herself. This do thou also do, O man—do not pray against thy enemy, but beseech God to put an end to thy despondency, to quench thy grief. By so doing this woman derived the greatest benefits from her enemy. For her enemy contributed to the bearing of the child. And how, I will tell. When she reproached her and made her distress greater, from the distress her prayer became more intense, the prayer drew God's favor and made Him consent, and so Samuel was born. So then if we be watchful, not only will our enemies be unable to do us hurt, but they will even bring us the greatest benefits, making us more zealous towards every thing.—Tr.].—*The prayer of faith in heart-grief and trouble:* 1) Its nature is that the heart (*a*) weeps itself out before the Lord, to whom tears wept before Him are well-pleasing, (*b*) pours out all its sorrow before the Lord, who wishes us to cast all outward cares upon Him; 2) Its reliance is (*a*) on the power of the "Lord of Sabaoth" to help, (*b*) upon His faithfulness, wherein He knows the special grief and woe of His children, and does not forget them; 3) It leads (*a*) to a firm hope that the request will be heard and granted, (*b*) to a joyful vow, that what the Lord graciously gives shall be thankfully given back to Him.—*What parents, especially mothers, so rear their children as to honor and please the Lord?* Those who 1) bear them, from the beginning of their life, prayerfully on the heart, 2) devote them, for their whole life, as an offering to the Lord.—*The highest appreciation of children's souls* consists in 1) regarding them as a gracious gift from the Lord, and 2) designing them as a grateful gift to the Lord.—[Hall: The way to obtain any benefit is to devote it, in our hearts, to the glory of that God of whom we ask it: by this means shall God both pleasure His servant, and honor Himself.—Tr.].

Ver. 12. Starke: A devout prayer must proceed from the very bottom of the heart, and may be offered *without* outward words as *with* them, Psalm xix. 15 [14]; xxvii. 8; lxii. 9 [8], Isa. xxix. 13, 14.—Vers. 13, 14. A Christian should not be too swift in judging, Luke vi. 37; 1 Cor. iv. 5; Prov. xvii. 27. Even upon pious or innocent people there are often many unjust judgments passed. J. Lange: We must be very careful in deciding from appearances, lest we sin against our neighbor, Acts ii. 13. Even pious teachers may err and mistake in judging their hearers, and regard some as ungodly who are truly pious.—Ver. 15. Cramer: He who is reviled, let him revile not again, but save his innocence with mild words, Rom. xii. 17. [Chrysostom speaks eloquently of the fact that Hannah did not scornfully neglect, and did not bitterly resent, the unjust accusation.—Tr.].—Prayer serves to lighten the heart; well for thee, O soul, if thou often seekest thus to lighten it, Ps. xlii. 5 [4]; lxii. 9 [8].—Ver. 17. Osiander: God is certain to hear our prayer, proceeding from true faith, and if He does not help us at all according to our will and as seems good to us, yet this is done for our best good, as He knows that it is most profitable for us.—When one has erred he should confess it, and also recall his error.—[Hall: Even the best may err, but not persist in it. When good natures have offended, they are unquiet till they have hastened satisfaction.—Tr.].—Ver. 18. J. Lange: It is a property of faith that it makes the heart happy and joyous for everything.—Ver. 19. Starke: A Christian must not only pray, but work; both bring blessings, Ps. cxxviii. 2.—Cramer: Although God never forgets His own, yet He often acts as if a stranger, Ps. xiii. 2 [1]; Jer. xiv. 8; Song of Sol. ii. 9.—Starke: When pious parents receive their children with calling on God and in His fear, then is every child a Samuel.—Osiander: When we have received a benefit from God, we should not forget gratitude to Him.

Vers. 12–20. *The fervent prayer of troubled souls:* 1) measures itself not by time, but exalts the soul above time into eternity; 2) troubles itself not about human observation and judgment, but is a pouring out of the heart before the living God; 3) suffers not itself to sink into grief and sorrow, but has for its fruit a joy given by the Lord.—*Defence against unjust accusations:* 1) For what *purpose?* As a tribute to truth, for the honor of the Lord, for the maintenance of our own moral worth; 2). In what *manner?* In quietness and gentleness without sinful passion, in humility and modesty; 3) By God's help, with what *result?* Convincing the accusers of their wrong, changing their bad words into blessings, lightening our own heart of a heavy load.—*The naming of children no indifferent matter for pious parents:* Thankfully regarding the grace of the Lord, who has given them; 2) Earnestly regarding the destination for the Lord, to whom they are to lead them.

SECOND SECTION.

Samuel's Consecration and Restoration to the Lord.

CHAP. I. 21–28.

I. *The child Samuel at home till he is weaned.* Vers. 21–23.

21 And the man Elkanah and all his house went up to offer unto the Lord
22 [Jehovah] the yearly sacrifice, and his vow. But Hannah went not up; for she
said unto her husband, *I will not go up* until the child be weaned, and *then* I
will bring him, that he may appear before the Lord [Jehovah], and there abide
23 for ever. And Elkanah her husband said unto her, Do what seemeth thee good;
tarry until thou have weaned him; only the Lord [Jehovah] establish his word.
So the woman abode, and gave her son suck until she weaned him.

II. *Samuel given back by his mother to the Lord.* Vers. 24–28.

24 And when she had weaned him, she took him up with her, with three bullocks,
and one ephah of flour, and a bottle of wine, and brought him unto the house of
25 the Lord [Jehovah] in Shiloh; and the child was young. And they slew a [the]
26 bullock, and brought the child to Eli. And she said, O my lord, as thy soul liveth,
my lord, I am the woman that stood by thee here, praying [to pray] unto the Lord
27 [Jehovah]. For this child I prayed; and the Lord [Jehovah] hath given me my
28 petition which I asked of him: Therefore also I have lent [given[1]] him to the Lord
[Jehovah]; as long as he liveth he shall be lent [he is given] to the Lord [Jehovah].
And he worshipped the Lord [Jehovah] there.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

1 [Ver. 28. Erdmann renders: I have made him one prayed for (asked, *erbeten*) to the Lord as long as he lives; he is asked to the Lord (for the Lord). See Exegetical Notes *in loco*.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 21. **And the man Elkanah and all his house went up.** This he did yearly, in order to present the *offering of the days* and the *vow*. The "offering of the days" is *the* annual offering, the offering which every Israelite was obliged and accustomed to present annually. "The offering of the days and the vow" is the brief statement of what is detailed at length in the Law. In going up with his whole house, Elkanah did as is commanded in Deut. xii. 17, 18: "Thou mayest not eat within thy gates *the tithe* of thy corn, or of thy wine, or of thy oil, or the firstlings of thy herds or of thy flock, nor *any of thy vows* which thou vowest, nor thy freewill-offerings, or offering of thine hand; but thou must eat them before the Lord thy God in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, thou and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy man-servant, and thy maid-servant, and the Levite that is within thy gates; and thou shalt rejoice before the Lord thy God." The *offering of the days* "is, as it were, the yearly reckoning with the Lord, the presentation of those portions of the property which fall to him in the course of the year." Hengstenberg, *Beit.* [*Contributions to an Introd. to the Pent.*] III., 89, 90.—The Sing. "*his vow*" refers to the vow which Elkanah also had made based on the hearing of Hannah's prayer. The addition of the Sept., "and all the tithes of his land" is, like the plural "his vows," to be referred to the translator's having in mind the above-quoted passage. Thenius (*ad locum*) remarks that the corresponding words וְכָל־מַעְשְׂרוֹת אַרְצוֹ [and all the tithes of his land] were probably purposely omitted by transcribers who regarded Samuel's Levitical descent as certain, according to 1 Chron. vi. 7 sq. and 19 sq.; but Josephus, who expressly describes Elkanah as a Levite, and follows the Alexandrine translation, has the addition also. It belongs to the category of explanatory additions and changes of which the Sept. is so full.

Ver. 22. After the child is weaned from his mother's breast, Hannah will bring him to the Sanctuary. That the Heb. verb (גָּמַל) means here "to wean," and does not include the idea of *education* (Seb. Schmid) as in 1 Kings xi. 20, is plain from the "gave suck," (וַתֵּינֶק) in ver. 23. The ground adduced for this opinion, namely, that the child would otherwise be troublesome to Eli,

is of no force; for, apart from the fact that a child three years old (this was the term of weaning, according to 2 Mac. vii. 27*) is not troublesome in the East, his nurture and education could be committed to "the women that served at the door of the Tabernacle of meeting," (ch. ii. 22).—The "*appearing before* the Lord," for which Hannah will bring her son to Shiloh, supposes the existence there of the National Sanctuary instituted by Moses, and answers to the law (Ex. xxiii. 17; xxxiv. 23): "Three times in the year all thy males shall *appear before the Lord Jehovah.*" The "abide for ever," all his life (עַד־עוֹלָם) indicates the life-long consecration to service in the Sanctuary from his weaning on, while otherwise this service was binding only from the 25th year to the 50th. By the education which the boy received in the Sanctuary he was even as a child to grow into the service; and moreover, as a child, he could perform little outward services (Then.), so that the objection, that, as a newly weaned child, he was unfit for the Temple-service, falls to the ground.

Ver. 23. **Only the Lord establish His word**, that is, maintain, fulfil it, bring it to completion. The "word" (דְּבָרוֹ) refers not merely to Eli's word, ver. 17, but to God's factual discourse, which consisted in hearing Hannah's prayer, and in the real promise which he had given, by the birth of the child, in reference to his destination to the service of the Lord. Bunsen excellently says: "*Word*, that is, may He fulfil what He designs with him and has promised by his birth, comp. vers. 11, 20. The words refer, therefore, to the boy's destination to the service of God, which the Eternal has in fact acknowledged by the partial fulfilment of the mother's wish." Similarly Calvin already: "Elkanah seeks from God, and suppliantly begs with prayers, that, since God has bestowed on him male offspring, He will consecrate him and make him fit for His service, and direct him by the power of His Holy Spirit, by which his service shall be grateful and acceptable to God." Since there is no express word of the Lord to which the "word" may be referred, the Sept. avoids the difficulty by translating (groundlessly) τὸ ἐξελθὸν ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου "that which came out of thy mouth." The Heb. text is not therefore to be changed (with Then.), to accord with the Sept., into "only, let *thy* word stand" (אַךְ תָּקִים אֶת־דְּבָרְךָ.) Clericus: "God had shown, not by words, but by very deed, that He approved Hannah's vow, and had promised her a living son; and Elkanah prays that He will perform His promise. There is therefore *no need to invent with the Rabbis an oracle† uttered* to the mother concerning the child about to be born."

Ver. 24, *sq.* The case is the same here with the diverging translation of the Sept., "with a three-year-old bullock" [instead of "three bullocks"], which is occasioned by the singular "the bullock" of ver. 25. The contradiction between "three bullocks" and "one bullock" cannot indeed be removed (with Bunsen) by regarding the sing. as collective, Judg. vi. 25 being cited in support of it; but it may properly be said with Keil that "the bullock" in ver. 25 denotes specially the offering with which the boy was returned to the Lord, "the burnt-offering by which the boy was dedicated to the Lord for life-long service in His Sanctuary, the two other bullocks serving for the yearly offering." As it was understood that the two others were for the yearly festival-offering, that is, burnt-offering and thank-offering, it was not specially mentioned that they were sacrificed. Further, three bullocks are required by the quantity (*one* ephah) of flour which Elkanah takes with him, since, according to Num. xv. 8–10, three-tenths of an ephah of flour was required for a burnt-offering of *one* bullock. The peace-offering, like the burnt-offering, was connected with a meat- and drink-offering.—A striking example of the arbitrary fashion in which the Alex. translators got over difficulties in the text is found in their translation μετ᾽ αὐτῶν "with them" at the end of ver. 24 [the Heb. reads "the child was a child"]; as if, instead of the difficult נָעַר ["child"], to which the sense requires the addition of the predicate "small," the text had read עִמָּם "with them." The addition of the Sept. to ver. 24, "and his father slew the offering which he made annually to the Lord, and he brought the boy near," and the translation in ver. 25, "and he slew the bullock, and Hannah the mother of the child brought him to Eli" are to be explained as efforts at exegesis, and give us no ground to correct the Heb. text, as Thenius supposes. Not the mother alone, but both parents gave the boy over to Eli, and thus presented him as an offering to the Lord.

Ver. 26 sq. Hannah makes herself known to Eli by reminding him of the circumstances under which she had prayed for the child (ver. 11 sq.)*—On "stood" (הַנִּצֶּבֶת) Clericus remarks: "they prayed to God standing." For the custom of standing in prayer comp. Gen. xviii. 22; xix. 27; Dan. ix. 20. In time of deeper devotion and emotion a kneeling posture also was adopted, (1 Kings viii. 54; 2 Chron. vi. 13; Ezra ix. 5).

Ver. 27. Three things move Hannah's soul deeply and joyfully: 1) The *recollection* of the moment when she stood here and called on God for this son; 2) the contemplation of the *answer*

* [Rashi says 22 months; Kimchi and others 24 months. For other opinions see "Synopsis Criticorum" *in loco*.—Tr.]

† [Rashi: "The Bath-qol ('daughter of the voice') went forth, saying: there shall arise a just one whose name shall be Samuel. Then every mother who bore a son called him Samuel; but when they saw his actions, they said, this is not Samuel. But when this one was born and they saw his manner of life, they said, this is that Samuel; and this is what the Scripture means, when it says, 'the Lord confirm His word,' that Samuel may be that just one."—Tr.]

* בִּי in connection with אֲדֹנִי is an interjection, "*hear*," or "*I beg*," or "*truly*, my lord," (Gen. xliii. 20; xliv. 18; Ex. iv. 10, 13; Num. xii. 11; Josh. vii. 8; 1 Kings iii. 17, 26). Many explain it as—"per me obsecro," citing the corresponding Arab oath "per me." Another explanation (Ges.) supposes a contraction of בְּעִי "request," since "in the Aramaic translations בָּבְעוּ stands for the Heb, בִּי, for which the Samaritans at least wrote בעו 'obsecro' without בְּ, Gen. xliii. 30." Ewald says: "Most probably בִּי is shortened from אָבִי (Job xxxiv. 36; 1 Sam. xxiv. 12), a simple Interjection."

to her prayer, and the granting of the thing asked, and 3) the *determination* now to restore to the Lord what He had given her in this answer to her prayer.

Ver. 28. "And also I" (וְגַם אָנֹכִי) refers back to the words "and the Lord hath given me," and implies a *requital, et ego vicissim,* "and I in my turn," (Cler.). "It cannot be shown that הִשְׁאִיל means "*lend,*" as is generally assumed; it occurs in 1 Sam. i. 28, in the sense of "grant," "give." Knobel on Ex. xii. 36. Further, the signification "lend" is here inappropriate, because the "I also" expressly brings out the correspondence to the "gave," of ver. 27. הִשְׁאִיל means "cause to ask or demand," "grant what is demanded," "*give.*" The sense is: the Lord gave him to me, and so have I also given him to the Lord, as one asked or demanded. Calvin: "The sense is plain enough, namely, that she gave, dedicated to God the child obtained from Him by prayer." The short concluding sentence "he is asked for the Lord," expresses her determination to give him to the Lord for His service.—"*They prayed,*" not sing., referring to Elkanah, but plur., Elkanah and Hannah, (comp. ver. 19), *Samuel* not being included. [The plur. "they prayed" is easier, but the Heb. reads "he prayed," (though some regard the form as plur.), and so Chald.; Syr. Ar. Vulg. have the plur.; Sept. omits the clause. If taken as sing. it no doubt refers to Elkanah, who, as head of the household, represented his wife and conducted the worship. (So Abarbanel הוֹרָה בְּנֶדֶר אִשְׁתּוֹ; he also mentions Samuel and Eli). This is the view of Keil and Wordsworth. The *Bib. Comm.* takes it as fem. sing., and makes Hannah the subject.—It is impossible to convey in an Eng. translation the fine play upon words of the Heb. in the principal sentence of this verse and the preceding. Literally it reads: The Lord has given me my *asking* which I *asked* of Him; and I also have caused the Lord to *ask* him; as long as he lives he is *asked* to the Lord. The contrast between the Qal and Hiph. of the verb "to ask" (שאל) is brought out in Ex. xii. 35 (*asked,* not *borrowed,* as in Eng. A. V.) and 36 (*gave,* not *lent*). Keil and Erdmann make the Hiph. a denominative from שָׁאוּל "asked" = "to make one asked," but there does not seem to be authority for this; the best rendering is "give."—Erdmann puts a semicolon after "liveth;" but it is better, with Chald. Syr. and Eng. A. V., to put it after the first Jehovah.—The ancient vss. (except Vulg.) take the היה "is" here to be equivalent to חיה "lives," or perhaps read חיה, and it is better to adopt the latter reading. Otherwise we must translate "and I also have given him to Jehovah all the days for which he was asked for Jehovah."—Tr.].

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The mother's determination, that the child should not be presented to the Lord in the Sanctuary till after he was weaned, was in keeping with the divine ordination that the child must first, in the bosom of natural maternal love, pass through the elementary conditions of the sustenance and earliest development of his physical life, before he could, in accordance with the divine destination, receive in the service of the Sanctuary the proper education and culture for his theocratic calling.

2. That God *gives* in answer to prayer, and that man *devotes* to God what he obtains, so that God *takes* again what He has given, or *lays claim* to it for the ends of His kingdom, is the law of reciprocity in the intercourse between the living God and His saints; the latter contribute nothing for the realization of the special ends of His kingdom, which they have not received from him, and are not by Him enabled to contribute.

3. Among the heroes of God's kingdom who have been brought to the Lord by the prayers of their mothers and consecrated as His instruments, Samuel is a shining example of the full, unselfish devotion of the whole life to the Lord's service, which is the condition of great profound capacity to further the kingdom of God.

4. An important principle of education is herein contained: every child should be devoted to the Lord's service, from the beginning of his life on, with self-denial and prayer; and, in accordance with this destination, should receive his life-direction by education, selfish parental love yielding to the counsel of the divine will. Calvin: "Hannah, forgetting her own advantage, gives all the glory to God, thinking it would be well enough with her, if only God were glorified; and indeed it is right to yield to God all we have, whatever it may be." In the education of children the *using* them to the divine and holy must begin with the *weaning.** From the beginning of his life the child must be "about his Father's business."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 21–28. The presentation of Samuel for constant service in the sanctuary. 1) What preceded it, according to Hannah's wish and Elkanah's consent (vers. 21, 22). 2) How it was performed, in bringing up Samuel to Shiloh and in delivering him to Eli and in prayer to the Lord (vers. 24–28).

Ver. 21. Osiander: After receiving divine benefits we should not be more slothful in performing divine service, but rather be so much the more diligent and industrious.—Pious mothers are performing acceptable divine service when they are rearing their children faithfully and in the fear of God.—It is no reproach to a man when he prefers his wife's better opinion to his own. [Ver. 23. Matt. Henry: So far was he from delighting to cross her, that he referred it entirely to her. Behold, how good and pleasant a thing it is, when yoke-fellows thus draw even in the yoke, and accommodate themselves to one another; each thinking well of what the other does, especially in works of piety and charity.—Tr.]

Ver. 24. Cramer: The rearing of children gives to parents, it is true, great toil and trouble, but when it is done in faith, it constitutes better works than when monks and nuns perform all their fasting, praying, castigations and indulgence-ceremonies; for those, not these, are enjoined by

* [The German is: mit der *Entwöhnung* schon hat die *Gewöhnung* . . . zu beginnen.—Tr.]

God in His word. Accordingly they are true acts of divine service, and receive from God their reward.

Ver. 25. VON GERLACH: That a three-year old boy should be already given over to the temple, was done in order that from the first awakening of his higher spiritual powers he might already be living amid these holy surroundings.—SEB. SCHMIDT: Children must at times be carried to divine service.—STARKE (vers. 26, 27): The wonders of God's goodness we should openly celebrate, and not keep silent about them. Ver. 28. Parents give their children back to God when they advance them to holy baptism, present them to God in prayer, and rear them in a Christian manner. [There are many who think this can be, and often is, quite as well performed without infant baptism as with it.—TR.]—CRAMER: We should devote to the ministry the best talents and dearest children.

[Ver. 28. *Giving back to the Lord:* 1) All we have was given by the Lord. 2) All we have should be really consecrated to Him, and regarded and treated as His. 3) The Lord will then make all promote both our good and His glory.—Vers. 10, 26-7. Agonizing supplication and joyful thanksgiving. Look on the two pictures and learn the lesson.—Chap. I. *Hannah, her sorrows and her joys:* I. Her sorrows. 1) She was childless. 2) She was derided and ridiculed. 3) She was unjustly accused by a good man. II. Her joys. 1) In the tender love of her husband. 2) In the answer to her agonizing prayer. 3) In being the mother of a prophet.—TR.] [CHRYSOSTOM has five sermons on Hannah, which are discursive as usual, but contain some passages in his best vein. *Works, ed. Migne,* Vol. IV., p. 631.—TR.]

THIRD SECTION.

Hannah's Song of Praise.

CHAP. II. 1-10.

1 AND Hannah prayed, and said:
My heart rejoiceth in the Lord [Jehovah[1]],
My horn is exalted in the Lord [Jehovah];
My mouth is enlarged [opened wide] over mine enemies,
Because[2] I rejoice in thy salvation.
2 There is none holy as the Lord [Jehovah],
For there is none beside thee,
Neither is there any [And there is no] rock like our God.
3 Talk no more so exceeding[3] proudly;
Let not arrogancy come out of your mouth;
For the Lord [Jehovah] is a God of knowledge,[4]
And by him[5] actions are weighed.
4 The bows of the mighty men are broken,
And they that stumbled are girded with strength.
5 They that were full have hired themselves out for bread,
And they that were hungry ceased [*ins. to hunger*[6]];
So that [Even[6]] the barren hath borne seven,
And she that hath many children hath waxed feeble.
6 The Lord [Jehovah] killeth and maketh alive,
He [*om.* He] bringeth down to the grave (underworld[7]) and bringeth up.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Instead of "Jehovah," 28 MSS., 3 printed copies, LXX. and Vulg., read "my God," which some prefer as a variation; Syr. and Ar. omit the word. It is better to keep the Heb. text.—TR.]

[2] ["Because" is omitted in Vat. LXX. (probably by clerical error), retained in Chald. and Syr.—TR.]

[3] [The Heb. here repeats the subst. גְּבֹהָה גְּבֹהָה, "pride, pride," in a superl. sense. Wellhausen takes these words as a quotation, and the ה as He local, "do not say, high up! high up!" but this rendering has little in its favor.—TR.]

[4] [Lit. "knowledges." Ewald and Erdmann render "an omniscient God."

[5] [Kethib is לא, "not," and so Syr. and Ar.; the Qeri לו, "by him," is found in many MSS., and LXX., Chald. and Vulg. See Dr. Erdmann's note.—TR.]

[6] [On these interpretations of חדלו and עד see exegetical note.—TR.]

[7] [Heb. שְׁאוֹל, Sheol. See exeget. note.—TR.]

7 The Lord [Jehovah] maketh poor and maketh rich,
He (*om.* He) bringeth low and lifteth up.
8 He raiseth up the poor out of the dust,
And [*om.* And] lifteth up the beggar [needy] from the dunghill,
To set them[8] among princes,
And to make [And he makes] them to inherit the [a] throne of glory:
For the pillars of the earth are the Lord's [Jehovah's],
And he hath set the world upon them.
9 He will keep the feet of his saints,[9]
And the wicked shall be silent[9] in darkness;
For by strength shall no man [not by strength shall a man] prevail.
10 The adversaries[10] of the Lord [Jehovah] shall be broken to pieces;
Out of heaven shall [will] he thunder upon them.
The Lord [Jehovah] shall [will] judge the ends of the earth,
And he shall [will] give strength unto his king,
And exalt the horn of his anointed.

[8] [The Heb. has no pronoun here. Some MSS. have a Yod paragog. which may represent an original Waw in the text. The sense is not affected.—Tr.]

[9] [Heb. has the sing. in Kethib, but the plur. of Qeri suits the connection better. (So Vulg.) The Kethib may be only a *scriptio defectiva*. (In Ps. xvi. 10 Kethib is plur.; Qeri, not so well, sing.)—חָסִיד is literally "a favored one," "beloved," rendered by Erdmann "*fromm*" (pious).—Erdmann renders "shall perish." The word means first "be silent," and then "perish,"—silence being a sign of destruction.—Tr.]

[10] [Here again Kethib is sing., and Qeri plur., and the verb is plur. Lit. "Jehovah—his adversaries shall be broken." LXX.: "the Lord will make his adversary weak;" Vulg.: "*dominum formidabunt adversarii ejus;*" Chald.: "Jehovah will destroy the enemies who rise up to hurt his people." This simpler construction (reading the verb as sing.) is adopted by Wellhausen and the *Bible Commentary*—but there is not sufficient ground for changing the existing Hebrew text.*—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. The *superscription*, "and Hannah *prayed*," does not suit precisely the contents of the following Song, which is not exactly a prayer (תְּפִלָּה) but a thanksgiving-testimony to the Lord and the revelation of His glory. Clericus: "Hannah rather sings praises to God than asks anything of Him." So the word "prayers" (תְּפִלּוֹת) in Ps. lxxii. 20, includes all the Pss. from 1 to 72, in the broad sense of thinking and speaking of God and in God's presence, when the heart is most thoroughly concentrated and deeply immersed in Him, though the form of thinking and speaking to God may be lacking. The "thou," however, referring to God, appears in two places (vers. 1, 2). [Chald.: "H. prayed in the spirit of prophecy."—Tr.].

The *content* of the Song is: 1) *The manifestation of deep joy in the Lord* at the deliverance vouchsafed by Him over against enemies (ver. 1). With lofty flight the four-membered strophe rises from the depth of the heart's joyful emotion on high, where the source of salvation and help in the living God is seen and praised. The *heart* (as elsewhere the soul) is the central organ of all painful and joyful feelings. The "*horn*" is the symbol—derived from horned beasts, which carry the head high in consciousness of power—of vigorous courage and consciousness of power, of which the Lord is the source, (comp. Deut. xxxiii. 17; Ps. lxxv. 5; lxxxix. 18, 25).* The repetition of the "in the Lord" emphasizes the fact that the joyous frame of mind and lofty consciousness of power has its root in the Lord, and presupposes the most intimate communion with the living God. The "*mouth* opened wide over my enemies," intimates that the joy and courage that filled her soul had found *utterance*, partly in exulting over adversaries, as contrasted with the silence of subjection to them, partly in proclaiming the glory of the Lord in thanks and praise for the help received from Him in the attacks of foes. The *ground* of her joy in the Lord is His salvation, His help against enemies. 2) The praise of the majesty of God in His *holiness* and His *faithfulness*, which is as *firm as a rock* (ver. 2). The "holy" indicates here in the broad sense the infinite superiority of God to everything earthly and human, His isolation from the world, but at the same time His absolute completeness of life in contrast with the nothingness and perishableness of everything in the sphere of the creaturely, as in Ps. xcix. 2–5; comp. 1 Kings viii. 27. This is evident from the double negation: "none is holy as the Lord; for there is none beside thee." The ground of this exclusive holiness is the aloneness and absoluteness of God; there is no God beside

* [There is no reason for supposing here a reference to the eastern custom among Oriental women, (Druses and others), of wearing silver-horns on the head to which the vail is attached, and which by their position indicate the woman's position as maiden, wife, or mother. There is no trace of such a custom among the ancient Hebrews. The word *qeren* "horn," is used of the horns of beasts, of horns for blowing and drinking, or for any horn-shaped vessel, (so, the name of Job's daughter Qeren-happuk "paint-horn," "eyepigment-horn"), and of a mountain-peak. It signifies also "ray of light," and the derived verb "to emit rays of light," as of Moses, Ex. xxxiv. 29. From the incorrect translation of the Vulg., "horned" probably came (as Gesenius suggests) the custom of the early painters of representing Moses with horns.—Tr.].

* [The Sept. inserts in ver. 10 a quotation from Jer. ix. 23, 24 differing slightly from the present Greek text in Jer. The Chald. gives a paraphrase of the Song rather than a translation, referring the words of the several verses to the Philistines, Nebuchadnezzar, Mordecai, the Greeks, and Magog.—Tr.]

Him, He shares the divine being [Germ. Sein und Wesen] with none; *therefore* He is apart from everything human and earthly, and lifted up above it.*—The words "there is no rock like our God," express the aloneness and exclusiveness of God's character as set forth by the name *rock*. This superiority of God to all earthly and worldly being, this absolute glory beyond everything finite and human does not exclude, but is the *ground* of His self-revelation as the Fixed, Unchangeable, Immovable amid everything earthly and human. The "*our* God" presupposes the revelation of God by which He, as the Holy One, has *chosen* His people to be *His possession*, announced Himself to this people as *their* God, and made a *covenant* with them. The symbolical designation of this covenant-God by *Rock*, which occurs frequently, was suggested naturally by the configuration of the ground in Palestine, where masses of rock surrounded by steep precipices offered an image of solid and sure protection. God is a *rock* in His firm unshakable faithfulness; and it is the more necessary to suppose this attribute to be here set forth, because His relation to His people as covenant-God is assumed in the words "*our* God." This term has the signification of *faithfulness* and indestructible trustworthiness in Deut. xxxii. 4, also; where it is clearly the same as אֱמוּנָה "faithfulness," Ps. xviii. 3, (2) sq.; xcii. 16.†—The presupposition is the declaration "there is none beside Thee." Jehovah, as the *Holy One* who has revealed Himself to His people as *their* God in His lofty elevation above the earthly and human, and is *alone* the truly existing living God, is for this very reason the *Rock* also in the absolute sense, the unchangeable, unshakably *faithful*, *trustworthy* God, and therefore claims from men, to whom He has revealed Himself as *their* God, and is known as such, unconditioned complete *confidence*, as it is expressed in this brief sentence, "*none is a rock like our God.*"‡

3) The manifestations of the holy and faithful God in His conduct, as it is determined by His *omniscience* and *omnipotence*, partly towards the *ungodly*, partly towards the *godly*, vers. 3 8).

Ver. 3. The negative particle is omitted before "come out" (יֵצֵא) as before "speak"§ (תְּדַבְּרוּ), and the sense requires that it be supplied (Gesenius, §152, 3). Partly by the "more," [Heb. literally, "do not increase to speak."—Tr.], partly by the doubling of the noun [גְּבֹהָה "pride;" in Eng. A. V. the intensive doubling is rendered by "exceeding,"—Tr.], the boastful vaunting character, the haughty soul of the ungodly is characterized, showing itself, as it often does, in arrogant words, and becoming, as it were, a second nature. The warning, "*talk not so proudly, proudly,*" stands in contrast with the praise of God's grandeur in His holiness, and brings out the more sharply the contrast between human pride and the humility which is appropriate towards the holy God. Herder's reference of the word (*Geist d. ebräisch. Poesie* 2, 282) to the "heights, which were used for defence, and in which pride was felt" is untenable, the Heb. not permitting it. The *talking* with so many proud and arrogant words stands in contrast with the expression of humility and gratitude in ver. 2: "My mouth is opened wide, *etc.*, there is none holy." ......" עָתָק "arrogance" specially marks the *haughty talk* as the expression of a bold defiant soul, which will not bend, and manifests itself particularly towards the pious and God-fearing by bold words, comp. Ps. lxxv. 6; xciv. 4; xxxi. 19. Sins of *word*, corresponding to the proud nature, are here emphasized, because what the heart is full of the mouth will speak.

His warning is supported by pointing to God's *omniscience* and *omnipotence*, in which the relation of His *holiness* to *earthly* and *human* things is shown. "*For* Jehovah is a God of omniscience." The plu. "knowledges" (דֵּעוֹת) indicates that God knows and is acquainted with every individual thing, that, as He is raised above every created thing, and thus present with all things and creatures, so they are present and known to Him; and thus it expresses the thought that the concrete content of God's omniscience is everything finite and created.* The proud and bold men, who speak so haughtily, must recollect that God knows all their deeds and hears their words, that therefore they cannot withdraw from His rule.—Secondly, reference is made to God's *power*, which controls all things according to a fixed unchangeable plan. We must first inquire whether the "actions" (עֲלִלוֹת) is to be understood of human or divine deeds, and then whether we are to read "not" (לֹא) or the Qeri "by him" (לוֹ). The first question can be decided only by the connection. The preceding context speaks not of the deeds, but of the words of ungodly men. In what follows it is similarly not works and deeds of men that are treated of, but the conditions and relations of human life, with which divine agency has to do; in ver. 4, *sq.*, the thought expressly confines itself to divine deeds. We cannot therefore with Böttcher (Aehrenlese, *in loco*) suppose a question, and, retaining the Kethib, render, "and are not deeds measured?" that is, "is not care taken that human deeds shall not become immoderate, insolent?" nor, with Thenius, adopting the Qeri, "and by Him actions are measured," that is, "He determines how far human doing may go;" nor, with Luther, paraphrase "the Lord does not suffer such conduct to prosper." But, if we have to suppose only divine deeds, then the translation "*to him* or *by him* actions are weighed or measured" is certainly

* [These ideas are not properly indicated by the word "holy," but may be said to be connected with and suggested by the lofty Heb. conception of the holiness of God.—Tr.]

† [*Bible-Commentary*: "That the name was commonly applied to God so early as the time of Moses, we may conclude from the names *Zurishaddai*, "my Rock is the Almighty," (Num. i. 6; ii. 12), and *Zuriel*, "my Rock is God." (Num. iii. 35).—Tr.].

‡ [More literally "there is not a rock like our God." —Tr.].

§ [This is not correct. The neg. is not omitted before תְּדַבְּרוּ which is, according to the Heb. syntax, merely an appendage of תַּרְבּוּ, forming with it a compound notion.—This paragraph is improperly assigned in the Germ. to ver. 4.—Tr.].

* [The Heb. plu. means not more than "great knowledge;" our author's exposition cannot be gotten from the simple Heb. word, but is an interpretation into the word (here probably warranted) of ideas gotten from the Scriptures in general.—Tr.].

to be preferred to the other—"are not actions weighed or measured, that is, determined?"—because of the vagueness of the thought in the latter. The thought, then, is this: God's actions are weighed, measured, fixed; He proceeds, in His working, by unchangeable paths established by Himself, so that none can free himself from His *omnipotence*, as none can withdraw from His all-pervading *omniscience*. Against the explanation "by Him the actions of men are weighed" (Bunsen: according to their essential worth), Keil properly urges: "God weighs the spirits, the hearts of men indeed (Prov. xvi. 2; xxi. 2; xxiv. 12), but not their deeds. This expression is never found." It is without ground, however, that he introduces the idea of *righteousness*, since we have here to do with nothing but the free, unrestricted activity of the divine *omnipotence*, to which, as to His omniscience, men are absolutely subject. [The correctness of this interpretation is open to doubt. The conception of God weighing His own actions, acting with prudence and forecast, is not, I believe, found elsewhere in the Bible; the higher conception of immutable wisdom is every where presented. On the other hand, that God weighs the actions of men, if not (as Keil says) explicitly stated, is yet involved in many passages, in all, for example, which set forth His righteous retribution; as, "Thou renderest to every man according to his work" (Ps. lxii. 12); "God shall bring every work into judgment" (Eccl. xii. 14); and comp. Ps. x. 18; xi. 5; xiv. 2; Prov. xv. 3; Job xxxiv. 21, 23; Jer. ix. 23, 24; Joel iii. 12. And this interpretation agrees very well with the context. The word "actions" may well include all exhibitions of human character, and the antithesis throughout the Song is between the wicked and the righteous. The thought, therefore, may be: Jehovah is holy and immutable. Give no exhibition of pride, for He knows and weighs your actions. He reverses human conditions, bringing down (*i. e.* the wicked), and setting up (*i. e.* the righteous). Expositors are about equally divided between these interpretations. With Erdmann are Targum, Sept., Theodoret, Patrick, Keil; in favor of the other, Syr., Clarke, Henry, Ewald; doubtful, Vulg., Synop. Crit., Gill, Wordsworth. Deut. xxxii. 4 does not seem to bear on the decision, for it is Jehovah's righteousness that is there emphasized.—Tr.]

Vers. 4–8 further carry out the thought of *God's almighty working in human life by a series of sharply contrasted changes of fortune.* In this it is *assumed* that God's omnipotent working is *just*, but it is not explicitly declared till afterwards. "The preceding thought is carried further: Every power which will be something in itself is destroyed by the Lord; every weakness, which despairs of itself, is transformed into power" (O. v. Gerlach).

Ver. 4. As in Isa. xxi. 17 we have *bows of heroes* instead of *heroes of the bow*, so here the symbol of human power and might is poetically put first instead of the personal subject. [Dr. Erdmann translates: "the heroes of the bow are cast down," which is, however, giving up the poetical form. Better: "the bows of heroes are broken." So in Isa. xxi. 17: "the residue of the bows of the heroes shall become small." — Tr.] The "broken" (חַתִּים) refers, according to the sense, to the latter (since "heroes" is the logical subject) instead of to "bows," the breaking of which indicates the broken power of those who, like heroes of the bow, trust to their might. The strong are overcome by God, as a hero loses his power when his bow is broken. The antithesis: "*And they that stumbled* [or, *stumble*] *are girded with strength.*" As stumbling, tottering indicates weakness and powerlessness, so "being girded" with strength denotes fitness for battle, power prepared for battle. The strong He deprives of strength, the powerless He makes strong—according to the free working of His power.

Ver. 5. The "full," who in the abundance of their wealth had no need, have hired themselves out for bread, that is, must earn their bread in order to appease their hunger. *On the other hand*, the hungry "cease" (חָדֵלּוּ) either "to be hungry," or, "to work for bread." The latter is preferable on account of the contrast with "hire themselves out for bread" in the first clause; so Herder ("they now have holiday") and Bunsen ("they no longer need work for bread"). Clericus: "Hannah here rightly attributes to divine providence what the heathen wrongly attribute to fortune, of whose instability they speak *ad nauseam*." See J. Stobæi, *florileg. tit.* 105.* The עַד ["till," rendered in Eng. A. V. "so that"] is taken by some expositors in the sense "even" [Germ. *sogar*]. Clericus explains it as a sort of ellipsis "as if she said that all experienced the vicissitudes of human affairs, even to the barren woman, who," *etc.* Similarly Keil explains it as a brachylogy: "it goes so far that" ..... *This* adverbial construction, with the presupposed logical zeugma, would have as much in its favor as the view of Thenius, who asks: "Might not עַד be an adverb: the *long barren?*" But there are passages in which עַד, from its sense of *continuance*, must be taken simply as a conjunction, meaning "*in that* or *while*" (Jon. iv. 2; Job i. 18; 1 Sam. xiv. 19); in the two last passages it is followed as here by וְ ["and"], and introduces an occurrence contemporaneously with which, or following on which, something else occurred. Here then: "*while the barren bears seven.*" "Seven children" is, according to Ruth iv. 15, the "complete number of the divine blessing in children" (Keil). Comp. Ps. cxiii. 9: "he makes the barren woman dwell in the house, the joyful mother of children." [Erdmann translates: "he makes the barren woman of the house dwell as a joyful mother of children." —Tr.] [Ps. cxiii. 7–9 resembles 1 Sam. ii. 5, 7, 8 so closely as to suggest an imitation. It would be very natural in a later writer, in composing a Psalm celebrating Jehovah's majesty and power, to take such general expressions from a well-known song, which we may suppose was committed to writing by Hannah herself, and through Samuel transmitted to the prophetic students, among whom, no doubt, were many psalmists. The Book of "Samuel" itself was probably in circulation soon after Rehoboam's time.—Tr.]

* [The word חדל is used in the Bible either absolutely —"cease to exist" (Judges v. 6, 7; Ps. xlix. 8 (9); Deut. xv. 11), or with an explanatory word (Job iii. 17; Pr. x. 9), or its complement is suggested by the immediate action or context (Am. vii. 5; Zech. xi. 12). * Here the statement is "the hungry ceased to exist as such," as in Judg. v. 6; Deut. xv. 11.—Tr.]

"And she who had many children languishes away." Clericus remarks: "being exhausted before the end of the usual bearing-time of women, and perhaps left solitary by the death of her children." As to this last point comp. Jer. xv. 9.* [The view held by some that in Hannah's barrenness and subsequent fruitfulness there is a mystical or typical meaning, deserves consideration. It is advocated by Jerome, Augustine, Patrick, Gill, Wordsworth, and the *Bib. Comm.* Hannah is said to be the type of the Christian Church, at first barren and reviled, afterwards fruitful and rejoicing. As to such a typical character we must be guided, not by outward resemblances, but by fixed principles of biblical interpretation. If Hannah's late fruitfulness is typical, it must be because it sets forth a spiritual element of the spiritual kingdom of God. These facts may guide us to a decision: 1) God's relation to His people is set forth under the figure of marriage; He is the husband, His people the wife (Isa. liv.; Jer. iii.; Hos. i.–iii.); 2) Isaiah (liv. 1) describes God's spiritual people as barren, yet with the promise of many children; 3) Paul (Gal. iv. 27) quotes this passage of Isaiah, refers it to the Church of Christ as distinguished from the Jewish dispensation, and declares that this antithesis is given in Sarah and Hagar. The barren Sarah is the new dispensation, the fruitful Hagar the old. Besides Sarah, other barren women in the Bible become the mothers of remarkable sons: Rebecca, Rachel, Samson's mother, Hannah, Elizabeth. Are these all typical of the new dispensation or the Church of Christ? The answer is to be found in Paul's treatment of Sarah's history. What he declares is, that Sarah is the mother of the child of *promise*, while Hagar's child was the product of natural fruitfulness. Thus Sarah sets forth the dispensation which is based on *promise* or *free grace* and faith; Hagar represents the dispensation of works. Paul quotes Isa. liv. 1, to show simply that the spiritual Jerusalem, the Church of Christ, is our mother. Throughout his argument it is the spiritual element of promise and faith on which Sarah's typical position is based. Only, therefore, where we can show such spiritual element are we justified in supposing a typical character. There must be involved the truth that the origination and maintenance of God's people depend on His promise and not on human strength. This is not necessarily involved in the history of every barren woman who becomes fruitful—certainly not in that of Rachel, probably in that of Rebecca, probably not in the others. These histories teach indeed that fruitfulness is the gift of God; and, as an encouragement to faith, He has in some instances granted to the barren to be the mothers of sons to whom He has assigned important positions in the development of His kingdom. But this fact does not in itself show that these mothers sustained to the kingdom of God the relation which Sarah sustained. Hannah seems to be simply a pious mother whose prayer for a son, contrary to human probabilities, is granted.—Tr.].

Ver. 6. This Keil connects with the preceding, explaining: This comes from the Lord, who kills, *etc.* But here, as in the remaining members of the Song, we must suppose a logical asyndeton. The contrast of death and life, killing and making alive demands even a wider extension of these conceptions than is indicated in the last clause of ver. 5. *Killing* denotes (with a departure from the ordinary sense) bringing into the extremest misfortune and suffering, which oppresses the soul like the gloom of death, or brings it near to death—*making alive* is extricating from deadly sorrow and introducing into safety and joy. This is confirmed by the second member: "He brings down to Sheol and brings up." The same contrast is found in Deut. xxxii. 39, "I kill and I make alive; I wound and I heal;" Ps. xxx. 4 (3), "Thou hast brought up my soul from Sheol, Thou hast made me alive," *etc.;* Ps. lxxi. 20, "Thou, who hast showed us great and sore trouble, wilt quicken us again, and wilt bring us up again from the depths of the earth," [Eng. A. V. reads, with Qeri, *me;* Kethib, *us.*—Tr.]. Ps. lxxxvi. 13: "Great is Thy mercy towards me, and Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest Sheol," (comp. Job v. 18, and Ps. lxxxviii. 4–6). So also in Ps. lxvi. 9, misfortune is conceived of as death, salvation as revival. Calvin: "in the word 'death' Hannah properly embraces everything injurious, and whatever leads step by step to death, as, on the other hand, the word 'life' includes everything happy and prosperous, and whatever can make a fortunate man contented with his lot." [As is apparent from the above exposition, there is no reference in this verse to the doctrine of the resurrection. The word שְׁאוֹל "Sheol," improperly rendered in Eng. A. V. "hell" and "the grave," means "the underworld," (Erdmann, the same, "unterwelt"), the gloomy abode of all the dead, conceived of by the Hebrews as the negation of all earthly activity. It thus became an image of darkness and suffering, only here and there illumined and soothed (as in Ps. xvi.) by the conviction that God's love would maintain and develop into fulness of joy the life which He had bestowed on His servants. —The word is usually supposed to mean a "hole," "cleft" like, Eng. *hell* (="hole," "hollow," German *hölle.*—Tr.].

Ver. 7. By His power the Lord determines the contrast of rich and poor, high and low; comp. Ps. lxxv. 8 (7). The thought of the second clause is developed in ver. 8, with the first half of which Ps. cxiii. 7, 8 agrees almost word for word. Being

* [Dr. Erdmann's translation of this clause (1 Sam. ii. 5) is hardly satisfactory. The word עַד (lit. "continuance) is used in the senses "while," "until," "so that," and the question is, which is the appropriate sense here. Erdmann renders: "while the barren bears, the fruitful waxes feeble,"—that is, the clause, according to him, affirms the contemporaneousness of the two things. This would be appropriate in a narration, but is inappropriate and feeble here. To judge from the passages cited, he supposes the sense to be: "and while the barren is still bearing (that is, in the midst of her bearing), the fruitful languishes," which is plainly out of keeping with the context. Rather we are to take עַד—in its well-sustained sense of "till"—as marking the limit of the action involved in the preceding context. The mutations in human life, brought about by God, reach to this astonishing point, namely, that the barren becomes fruitful and the fruitful barren. So Vulg. (*donec*) and Sept. (ὅτι). The other versions do not translate the עַד. Gesenius and Fürst take the word as a preposition: "even the barren, she bears." But it may also be a conjunction. It sometimes by suggestion (though not properly) includes the fact which it introduces.—Tr.]

low is here regarded as being despised, for "dust and dunghill" indicate a condition of deepest dishonor and disgrace, in which one is, as it were, trodden under foot; comp. Ps. xliv. 26 (25). The "raising and lifting" denotes the divine government, by which shame and contempt are changed into honor and glory. The contrast to the dust and the dunghill is the sitting in the company of nobles and princes, on the throne of honor. Calvin: "Hannah goes on to say the same thing of honors and dignities as of fortunes, namely, that, when we behold in this world so many and so great vicissitudes, we should lift up our gaze to the providence of God, who rules all things in heaven and earth by His will, not imagining that there is anything fortuitous in our lives, (. . . but knowing that God's providence controls everything)."—The two last clauses point to the *foundation* of the Lord's determination and arrangement of the contrasted relations of life and fates of men: "*for the pillars of the earth are Jehovah's, and He hath set the earth upon them.*"* The *control* and *government* of God here portrayed is founded on the fact that He is the *creator* and *sustainer* of the earth, and therefore by His *omnipotence* exercises unrestricted rule over the earth-world. Here we have clear and plain the highest point of view, from which all that is said from ver. 4 on is to be looked at: the all-embracing power of the Lord. Clericus: "Hannah, therefore, means to say that God easily effects any change in human affairs, since He is creator and lord of the earth itself."

4. The Song culminates (vers. 9, 10) in the prophetic *testimony to the omnipotent rule of the holy God in the manifestation of His justice* towards the godly and the ungodly, and in *conducting His kingdom* to glorious victory over the world. *a*) To the *godly* the Lord will grant His *protection* and *salvation*, and will guard them from *misfortune*, comp. Ps. lvi. 13 (14): "Wilt Thou not deliver my feet from falling, that I may walk before God in the light of life [Germ. as Eng. A. V.: 'the living']?" So Ps. cxvi. 8; cxxi. 3; "he suffers not thy foot to fall." The *tottering* [or *falling*] of the feet is not to be taken here in an ethical sense; the preservation of the feet from slipping, tottering, stumbling, often denotes deliverance from long-continued misfortune and suffering, so Ps. xv. 5; lv. 23; lxvi. 9. "*His* saints" points to the intimate association between God and His people, and its correlative is "*my God,*" "*our God.*" *b*) *The godless will be the objects of His punitive justice. They will perish in darkness.* The *darkness* is the symbol of misfortune and misery, as *light* of safety and life, Job xv. 22; Ps. cvii. 14. Godlessness is voluntary remoteness from the light of salvation, which God sheds abroad; and so its walking in darkness must end in destruction. *For*, not by strength, that is, by *his own* strength, shall a man *prevail;* "shall a man be strong" (יִגְבַּר־אִישׁ) is an allusion perhaps to the "mighty men" (גִּבֹּרִים) in ver. 4. The godless rely on their own strength with which to help themselves in the darkness. But it is universally true that "we do nothing by our own strength." Ps. xxxiii. 16, 17. He who leans on his own strength (which cannot be without turning away from the Lord, who alone can help) will receive his just reward, he will perish in darkness. Clericus: "No one can avoid calamity by his own strength, unhelped by divine providence."—Human weakness is here specially brought out by the order of the words; on *man* [Heb. אִישׁ last word in ver. 9] follows immediately Jehovah [in the Heb., first word in ver. 10], which further stands as absolute subject (comp. Ps. xi. 4) and thus in sharper contrast. As "prevail" in ver. 9 alludes to ver. 4, so here the "broken" to the "broken" in that verse.—The thought, that God's justice is shown in the punishment of the godless, is first very strongly and sharply expressed by the immediate collocation of the two verbs after Jehovah: "broken are his opposers,"* and then illustrated by the allusion to a judicial process which ends with the carrying out of the sentence. The ungodly *strive* with God as in a judicial contest (מְרִיבָיו [Qeri]), but they are *confounded* in the presence of the process of law to which the Lord comes. The *thunder*, the sign of His fear-inspiring and destructive power, is the announcement of His proximity to the tribunal. The "judge" (יָדִין) denotes the holding of the court. The *judicial work* of God is the outflow of His holiness, justice and almightiness, which three attributes of God have been celebrated up to this point. The *object* of the judicial interposition of God is not only the members of the chosen people, but the *ends of the earth*, that is, all peoples, the whole world. As before the whole earthly creation, founded and maintained by God's power, was brought before us in order to establish God's almighty control over the earth, so here our view is extended from punitive justice as it shows itself in the sphere of God's people to God's judgment as it stretches over the whole earth, to the all-embracing world-judgment. The prophetic view often rises to this universality of God's judicial control as the judge of the whole world (Gen. xviii. 25), which corresponds to the idea of the universal salvation embracing all the nations of the earth; so, for example, Mich. i. 2 sq.; Isa. ii. 9 sq.; iii. 13; Ps. vii. 8 sq.; ix. 8. The conception of this general judgment over all the peoples of the earth, and that of the special judgment over Israel and every individual member of Israel are closely connected. The *aim* of both is to lead God's kingdom to victory and glory. The broad glance at the ends of the earth filled with the judicial glory of King Jehovah fixes itself in the concluding words on the highest aim and end to be reached by the exercise of God's judicial justice, namely, the unfolding of God's power and dominion in the *kingdom* in Israel and in the *person* of His *anointed*. "*And He will give strength to His king, and exalt the horn of His anointed.*"

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

After the explanation of the *content* of this Song of praise of Hannah, we must in the first place consider the question of its *origin*. The answer

* [It is not necessary to find a geographical theory in this poetical statement. And, even if it expresses the author's geographical views, it is *not the thought* of the passage, but only the *framework* of the thought; the real thought here is solely religious, and has nothing to do with physical science.—Tr.]

* [Heb. literally: "Jehovah, broken are His opposers." Some render, "Jehovah will break His opposers."—Tr.]

to this question is inseparable from our *historical* conception and estimate of the content of the Song, and is therefore connected with the historical and theological remarks. The question is: whether, as the author obviously assumes, Hannah herself sang it from her heart, or, whether it owed its origin to a totally different occasion, and was put into Hannah's mouth by the author.

According to Ewald, this Song is an interpolation by a later hand, because ver. 1 is the immediate continuation of the concluding words of the first chapter, and is therefore a proper ending like ch. i. 19, ("they worshipped and returned"); but we reply that the words, ch. i. 28, "they worshipped the Lord there," form an appropriate introduction to the following prayer, and that the latter contains nothing out of keeping with the continuity of the narrative—rather its content quite suits the situation, and therefore from this point of view there is no necessity for regarding it (from its content) as a later insertion which breaks the connection.—But particularly *two things* in the *content* have been adduced against the ascription of the Song to Hannah or to Hannah's time: the celebration of a glorious victory over foreign enemies, and the assumption of the existence of the theocratic kingdom in the conclusion.—But, as to the *first*, where in the Song is there the mention of a victory gained in war with foreign enemies? The only passage in which warriors are spoken of contrasts the "mighty bowmen" with the stumbling who are girded with the strength, not to portray heroes of war, but to show how this contrast also (which is parallel with others, none of which have anything to do with war) is brought about by the Lord's omnipotent rule. The description of these contrasts and of the power of God which reveals itself in them is so general that it is impossible to discover here the character of a Song of victory which presupposes a war. The "enemies" against whom the Song is directed are not the national enemies of the people of Israel, the heathen nations with whom they had to fight, but the ungodly within the chosen people as opposed to the truly pious and God-fearing. The contrasts which are introduced have their root in the fundamental view of the religious-moral opposition of pride and humility in reference to the holy God (ver. 3, *a*), culminate in the testimony to God's righteous judgment on godly and ungodly, and in their movement between these poles exhibit only the *religious-moral* condition of the people of Israel as the historical background. Nothing is said of opposition to external national enemies. Hence it is just as unfounded to regard David as the author of the Song (Bertholdt, *Einl.* III. 915), especially to suppose it a Song of praise for his victory over Goliath and the resulting defeat of the Philistines, (Thenius 1 ed., Böttcher), as it is arbitrary to suppose one of the oldest Kings of Judah its author.* Neither one nor the other can be demonstrated, or even shown to be probable.—The *second* argument against the ascription of the Song to Hannah, and for referring it to the period of the Kings seems weightier; for the words of ver. 10, "He will give strength to his king, and exalt the horn of His anointed," seem to assume the existence of a king. But nothing obliges us so to understand it. If we put ourselves in the period of Samuel's early life, the fact is incontestable that in the consciousness of the people, and the noblest part of them too, the idea of a monarchy had then become a power, which quickened more and more the hope of a realization of the old promises that there should be a royal dominion in Israel, till it took shape in the express demand which the people made of Samuel. The divine promise that the people should be a kingdom is given as early as the *patriarchal period*, comp. Gen. xvii. 6, 16. The idea of the kingdom as bringing prosperity to the whole people connects itself with the Tribe of Judah, Gen. xlix. 10. Judah will come forth victorious from the battle which awaits him, will remain in possession of everlasting imperishable dominion, and will never lose the sceptre. The *period of the Law* further develops the idea of this kingdom. The whole people is to be a priestly kingdom (Ex. xx. 6). In Balaam's prophecy the royal power and dominion to which Israel would attain is celebrated under the figure of the Star which rises on Jacob, and in their victory over their enemies, Num. xxiv. 17, 19. This old prophecy is altogether unintelligible if the consciousness of the people did not attach the hope of future development and prosperity to the idea of the kingdom. That the law of the king in Deut. xvii. belongs to the legal period has been improperly doubted, (comp. Oehler in Herzog's *R.-E. s. v.* Königthum). The proposition made to Gideon to be king (Judg. viii. 23), though rejected by him, shows how in the *period of the Judges* the felt national disintegration brought out more strongly the desire for a single government which should embrace the whole people and protect them against external enemies. The phrase of refusal "*Jehovah* shall rule over you," is based on the external non-theocratic conception of the kingdom which underlay that application, and at the same time expresses in the clearest manner the consciousness of the divine rule of which the kingly rule was to be the organ. At the close of the period of the Judges the need of such a theocratic kingdom was felt the more strongly, because the office which was entrusted with the duty of forming and guiding the theocratic life of the nation, namely, the high-priestly office, was itself with the people involved in the deepest degradation. The hope thereon based, that the Lord would set up a kingdom as the instrument of saving the people from their deep corruption, is expressed in our Song in the concluding mention of the anointed of the Lord, who would receive his power from Him, whose horn would be exalted by the hand of the Lord. The same thought is expressed by that man of God (ch. ii. 35), who announces to the High-priest Eli the judgment of his house and the raising up of a faithful priest who will walk before the anointed of the Lord; that is, he indicates a direct interposition by God in the fortunes of His people, by which a new order of things will be brought about under the guidance of a true theocratic priesthood

* [Equally arbitrary is the procedure of Geiger (*Urschrift u. Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, page 27), who makes Hannah's Song an imitation of Ps. cxiii., and refers the latter to the postexilian period, explaining נְדִיבִים as foreign princes reigning over Israel!—Tr.].

in connection with a divinely established kingdom.

This was a testimony of the prophetical spirit which animated that man of God, that spirit of the prophecy and announcement of divine truth and promise, which had by no means completely died out in the time of the Judges. When God introduced the new era of Israel's fortunes, the elevation of the theocratic development of His people's life to a new plane by the prophet Samuel as instrument of His revelation, and first of the continuous theocratic line of prophets, He selected persons in the border-time between the old and the new in whom theocratic hopes dwelt in living power, informed them by direct influence of His Spirit of the approaching fulfillment of this hope, and prepared and impelled them to announce and to celebrate by prophetic testimony God's new revelations of salvation. The "*man of God*" made such an announcement to Eli, who, according to the divine counsel, was to fall together with his house, that a new true priesthood might arise, which should be closely connected with the "anointed of the Lord," the theocratic kingdom, in its effort to attain its end and aim, namely, God's dominion over His people. *Hannah* made such an announcement respecting her child Samuel, she knowing by divine revelation that he was to be God's instrument for great things, the renewer and restorer of the theocratic life under the God-given kingdom. She, like that man of God, is filled with the spirit of prophecy, whose representative and instrument she was the more fitted to be, as she belonged to the pious class of the people, and walked before God. Her song is a product of this prophetic spirit, which lifts her far above the joy (felt in her heart, and uttered at the outset) of her heard prayer and God's acceptance of her child to be His possession, and above her personal experience of the might of the living God, and makes her see and celebrate His manifestations of might in his kingdom, which he has established in his people, and will develop in new glory by the revelation of His power and justice. From the depths of humble piety she looks up away from her poor self to the height of the holiness and faithfulness of the living God. The foundations on which rests all God's revelation to His people, as well as His dominion over them, are His holiness and rock-firm faithfulness. On them is built God's government in His kingdom and people, to which Hannah is led by the divine providence in her own life to look up. As she looks, her experience of her "adversaries" and of their pride and presumption is broadened and generalized into a view of God's absolute government and dominion which brings to shame all the pride and insolence of the ungodly, and which is revealed, partly in the unlimited, unconditioned rule of His *might*, which accomplishes the life-changes of godly and ungodly in the extremest contrasts, contradicting all human calculation (vers. 4-8), partly in the government of His *justice*, in which He shows Himself as the unchangeable rock of the godly, and gives the ungodly over to destruction (vers. 9, 10). From the idea of this government of justice the song rises finally with rapid flight to the conception of a judgment which the living, just God stretches with His dominion over the ends of the earth, and to the idea of a kingdom, which, in this divine domain, and by this ruling and governing of God, develops its power beyond the limits of Israel, and in the possession of this God-given power is the instrument of the divine dominion—a wide extension of the prophetic view, under the guidance of the divine Spirit, beyond the present which is the foundation of the word of the prophetic testimony. Thus the prophetic-historical description of the establishment of the kingdom in Israel is introduced by this lyric-prophetic witness of the God-ordained and God-serving power of the theocratic kingdom; and on this follows soon the prophetic announcement of the intimate relation in which the renovated priesthood is to stand to the "anointed of the Lord." Hannah "beholds in her individual experience the general laws of the divine economy, and divines its significance for the whole history of the kingdom of God" (Auberlen, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1860, p. 564).

In this song—uttered, in the spirit of prophecy, in the beginning of the development of the theocratic life, in so far as that development was determined by the kingdom which the people hoped for and God gave—Hannah passes unconsciously, impelled by the divine Spirit, over all the intermediate steps of the development of the kingdom of God, and points to the final goal, at which the divinely established, divinely equipped, royal dominion extends itself over the ends of the earth. To this answers, on the one hand, the idea of a universal revelation of salvation, which appears in that tribe-promise of the Shiloh, to whom the obedience of the nations belongs, and farther back in the patriarchal promises; and, on the other hand, there is connected with it the prophetic content of the songs of praise of Mary and Zachariah (Luke i. 46 sq. and 68 sq.), where there is express reference to the words of Hannah in view of the approaching final fulfillment of the idea, contained in her prophetic announcement, of the dominion of the anointed of the Lord which in divine power is to extend over the ends of the earth.

[Wordsworth: "The *Magnificat* of Hannah is an evangelical song, chanted by the spirit of Prophecy under the Levitical Law. It is a prelude and overture to the Gospel. It is a connecting link of sweet and sacred melody between the Magnificat of Miriam after the passage of the Red Sea—symbolizing the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ—and the Magnificat of Mary, after the Annunciation of His Birth. . . . . Let this Song of Hannah be read in the Septuagint, and then the Magnificat in St. Luke's original, and the connection of the two will be more clearly recognized. . . . The true characteristic of Sacred Poetry is, that it is not egotistical. It merges the individual in the nation, and in the Church Universal. It looks forward from the special occasion which prompts the utterance of thanksgiving, and extends and expands itself, with a loving power and holy energy, into a large and sympathetic outburst of praise to God for His love to all mankind in Christ. . . . . . The Magnificat of Hannah is conceived in this spirit. It is not only a song of thanksgiving; it is also a *prophecy*. It is an utterance of the Holy Ghost moving within her, and making her maternal joy on the birth of Samuel to overflow in outpourings

of thankfulness to God for those greater blessings in CHRIST, of which that birth was an earnest and a pledge. In this respect it may be compared with the Song of Moses (Deut. xxxii.) and the Song of David (2 Sam. xxii.)."—Augustine, in his comment on this Song (*De Civ. Dei*, 17, 4), follows the translation of the Sept. (which is often incorrect), and, along with some good thoughts, has much wrong exegesis and unfounded spiritualizing.—TR.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1. *The joy in the Lord*, to which faith attains amid sore conflicts: 1) Its *source*—*not* our own heart with its frowardness and its despondency, *not* help and consolation from men, but only the Lord's grace and compassion, which make the heart joyous again, lifting up with mighty power the mind that has been stricken down; 2) Its *object: the fulness of the salvation* which the Lord dispenses, and faith ever more richly appropriates: 3) Its *expression:* an open *testimony* to the salvation experienced—before *God* in *praise*, ("I rejoice in thy salvation"), before *men*—in confessing and celebrating our experience of salvation, to our companions in the faith that they may unite with us in joy and praise, so that their faith may be strengthened, to the adversaries of the faith that they may be ashamed, may be warned, may repent.—[Hannah's song of praise compared with her former prayer. 1) She was then "in bitterness of soul" (i. 10); now her "heart rejoiceth." 2) Then she was humiliated (i. 5, 8, 11); now she is "exalted." 3) Then her adversary provoked her (i. 6); now her "mouth is opened wide over her enemies." 4) Then she "poured out her soul before the Lord" (i. 15); now she "rejoices in His salvation." Often we remember to pray, and then forget to praise.—TR.].

Ver. 2. *The two characteristics of the life of God's children* in their relation to the living God: 1) The humble *reverence* before Him, in view of His *holiness;* 2) The heartiest *confidence* in Him, in view of His unchangeable *faithfulness.*

Ver. 3. *The humbling of the natural man's pride* through the testimony concerning the living God: 1) Concerning his *universal knowledge;* 2) His *universal wisdom* which determines and regulates all the details of His action (ver. 3); 3) His *universal power* which determines every change in the fortunes of human life, (vers. 4-8). [The division 2) must be modified if the view of Tr. be adopted as to the reference of the term "actions." See Exegetical on ver. 3.—TR.]

[Ver. 3. "By Him actions are weighed." I. The manner of His weighing—with perfect knowledge (ver. 3), with absolute rectitude (ver. 2), with immutable justice (ver. 2).—II. The result of His weighing is often a total reversal of men's fortunes (vers. 4–8). Application: Be not proud of present prosperity, but look well to the way in which you enjoy and use it (ver. 3).—TR.].

[HENRY: Vers. 1—3. Hannah's triumph in God's perfections, and in His blessings to her. I. She celebrates His glorious attributes: (1) His purity. (2) His power. (3) His wisdom. (4) His justice. II. She solaces herself in these things. III. She silences those who are enemies to her and to God.—Vers. 4–8. Providence in the changes of human life: 1) The strong are weakened and the weak strengthened, when God pleases (ver. 4). 2) The rich are impoverished and the poor enriched (ver. 5). 3) God is the Lord of life and death (ver. 6). 4) He advances and He abases (vers. 7, 8). 5) And in all this we must acquiesce, for God is sovereign. "The pillars of the earth are the Lord's."—TR.]

Vers. 4–8. *The unity amid change of the opposite ways* which the *pious* and the *ungodly* must go: 1) *One* starting-point, the Lord's inscrutable will, which determines them; 2) *One* hand, the almighty hand of the Lord, which leads them; 3) *One* goal at which they end, humble submission under that hand.—*The wonderful guidance of the children of men upon quite opposite ways:* 1) The opposite *direction* in which they go, (*a*) from the height to the depth, (*b*) from the depth to the height; 2) The opposite *design* which the Lord has therein with men, (*a*) to lead them from the heights of pride and haughty self-complacency to humble submission under His unlimited power, (*b*) to exalt them from the depths of humble self-renunciation to a blessed life in the enjoyment of His free grace; 3) The opposite *end*, according as men cause the divine design to be fulfilled or defeated in them: (*a*) everlasting destruction without God, (*b*) everlasting salvation and life in and with God.

Vers. 3–10. The *contrasts which the change in the relations of human life presents to us in the light of divine truth:* 1) God's *holiness* and man's *sin;* 2) God's *almightiness* and man's *powerlessness;* 3) God's *gracious design* and man's *destruction.*

Ver. 4. *Weakness and strength come from the Lord:* 1) He makes the strong weak; 2) He makes the weak strong.

Ver. 5. *The Lord alone gives full satisfaction:* 1) He leads from false contentment in carnal fulness to wholesome destitution; 2) He changes hunger into blessed fulness with true contentment. [Fanciful and strained.—TR.]—*Blessed are they that hunger:* 1) Because the Lord brings them from full to hungry, 2) From hungry to full.

Ver. 6. *How the living God shows Himself as the Lord of life and of death:* 1) In that He leads from *life* into *death*, 2) From *death* into *life.*

Vers. 7, 8. *The sovereign rule of the grace of God:* 1) It makes poor, in order to make rich; 2) It humbles, in order to exalt.

Vers. 9, 10. *The Lord our God is a just God:* 1) Upon the pious He bestows salvation in His light; 2) The ungodly he causes to perish in darkness.—*As man* with his whole life places himself towards God, *so will God in the judgment place Himself towards him as a just Judge:* 1) Either in the severity of His punitive justice; 2) Or in the kindness of His saving grace.—*The great Either—Or*—which God's word writes *over every human life:* 1) Either with the pious *for* the Lord, or with the ungodly *against* Him; 2) Either trusting alone in the saving might of divine grace, or wishing to be strong by one's own power; 3) Either preserved by the Lord with the pious to everlasting *life*, or banished with the ungodly to everlasting *condemnation.*

Ver. 10. *The judgment of God's punitive justice* ("The Lord will judge"): 1) *Whom it threatens*—the ungodly, "adversaries." 2) How God makes

it approach with *warning signs* ("out of heaven shall be thunder"). 3) How it *discharges itself* against all the *world* that is opposed to God ("The Lord shall judge the ends of the earth"). 4) How it *promotes the perfecting of His Kingdom.*

[Providence in the national government of Israel. Not only was the secular spirit in the nation beginning to desire a king (viii. 5), but the inspired Hannah here predicts it with devout hope. Theocracy, Monarchy and Hierarchy each contributed in turn to the welfare of Israel, and each helped to prepare the way for the great Anointed, at once Prophet, King, and Priest, who should reign over the spiritual Israel.—Interesting lectures might be made on "Psalms outside of the Book of Psalms." (See above, additions to Historical and Theological.)—Tr.]

FOURTH SECTION.

Samuel's Service before the Lord in Contrast with the Abominations of the Degenerate Priesthood in the House of Eli.

Chap. II. 11–26.

I. *The conduct of the sons of Eli in contrast with Samuel, the "servant of the Lord."* Vers. 11–17.

11 And Elkanah went to Ramah to his house. And the child did minister [minis-
12 tered] unto the Lord [Jehovah] before Eli the priest. Now [And] the sons of Eli
13 were sons of Belial [wicked men]; they knew not the Lord [Jehovah]. And[1]
the priest's custom [the custom of the priests] with the people was that, when any
man offered sacrifice, the priest's servant came, while the flesh was in seething, with
14 a[2] flesh-hook of three teeth in his hand; [,] And he (*om.* he) struck it into the
pan, or kettle, or cauldron or pot; all that the flesh-hook brought up the priest
took for himself.[3] So they did in Shiloh unto all the Israelites that came thither.
15 Also [Even] before they burnt the fat, the priest's servant came, and said to the
man that sacrificed, Give flesh to roast for the priest; for he will not have sodden
16 flesh of thee, but raw. And if any [the] man said unto him, Let them not fail to
burn[4] the fat presently, and then take as much as thy soul desireth; [,] then he
would answer [say] him [*om.* him[5]], *Nay*, but thou shalt give it *me* [*om.* me] now;
and if not, I will take it by force. Wherefore [And] the sin of the young men
17 was very great before the Lord [Jehovah]; for men abhorred the offering of the
Lord [Jehovah].

II. *Samuel as minister before the Lord.* Vers. 18–21.

18 But [And] Samuel ministered before the Lord [Jehovah], being [*om.* being] a
19 child, girded with a linen ephod. Moreover [And] his mother made him a little
coat [tunic], and brought it to him from year to year, when she came up with her
20 husband to offer the yearly sacrifice. And Eli blessed Elkanah and his wife, and
said, The Lord [Jehovah] give thee seed of this woman for the loan which is lent to
the Lord [in place of the gift which was asked for Jehovah[6]]. And they went unto

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 13. Erdmann attaches this clause to the preceding, putting a full stop after "people." See Exegetical Notes *in loco.*—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 13. The Heb. has the Def. Art.; but, as the word is more naturally in st. const., the Art. is better omitted with Sept.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 14. The Eng. A. V. here follows the Sept.; Heb. reads בּוֹ "in it;" Erdmann, *damit*, "therewith."—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 16. The Heb. Inf. Abs.: "let them (or, they will) verily burn."—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 16. Kethib is "to him," Qeri "no" (and so 18 MSS., some printed Eds., LXX., Syr., Vulg., Arab., and one MS. of Targ. cited by De Rossi); the latter better suits the following כִּי, which, however, yields a good sense as it stands in the text. It may be translated "but," supposing a preceding "nay," as in Eng. A. V.; or regarded as introducing the substantive clause, and rendered "that."—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 20. Lit.: "in place of the petition which one asked for Jehovah." Erdmann changes the form of the verb to the fem., and renders "instead of the begged one (*des Erbetenen*) whom she begged from the Lord." Others point as part. pas. שָׁאוּל. The 3 sing. fem. is found in one MSS.; 2 sing. "thou askedest" in one MS., LXX., Syr., Vulg.; and Arab. has "thou gavest." It is better to retain the Heb. text and render it as impersonal.—Tr.]

21 their own home [to his[7] place]. And the Lord [Jehovah] visited Hannah, so that
[and] she conceived, and bare three sons and two daughters. And the child
Samuel grew before the Lord [Jehovah].

III. *Eli's conduct towards his worthless sons.* Vers. 22-26.

22 Now [And] Eli was very old, and [*ins.* he] heard all that his sons did unto all
Israel, and how [that] they lay with the women that assembled [served[8]] at the
23 door of the tabernacle of the congregation [meeting (*or* assembly)]. And he said
unto them, Why do ye such things? for I hear of your evil dealings [deeds] by
24 [from] all this people. Nay, my sons; for it is no good report that I hear; ye
25 make the Lord's people [Jehovah's people are made] to transgress. If one man
sin against another [If a man sin against a man], the judge [God[9]] shall judge[10]
him; but if a man sin against the Lord [Jehovah], who shall intreat[10] for him?
Notwithstanding [And] they hearkened not unto the voice of their father, because
26 the Lord would slay them [for it was Jehovah's will to slay them]. And the child
Samuel grew on and was in favour [grew in stature and favour[11]] both with the
Lord [Jehovah] and also [*om.* also] with men.

[7] [Ver. 20. The plu. suffix "their" is found in 12 MSS., Syr., Chald., Ar.; Vulg. "*in locum suum*;" some MSS. of Targ. have the sing. Wellhausen, combining LXX. and Heb., gives as the true reading "he went to his place;" but the more difficult reading seems preferable. See Exeg. Notes *in loco.* Erdmann's translation omits, by typographical error, the last sentence of ver. 20.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 22. The verb means "to perform service, military or other." So in Ex. xxxviii. 8.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 25. See Exeg. Notes *in loco.*—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 25. Erdmann: "will adjust" and "who can use his interest (or interpose) to adjust."—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 26. See Exeget. Notes *in loco.*—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. Vers. 11-16. In ver. 11 the Sept. again clearly shows the effort to combine explanations with the translation of the Heb. text, rendering: "and they *left* him there, and *they* went away." [The Vat. MS. reads in both instances "she" instead of "they."—Tr.]. There is the less need to change the Heb. text to accord with this, because, as Böttcher (*ubi sup.* p. 69) rightly remarks, "the Elkanah" of the former is quite sufficient, since this name would suggest to every reader Elkanah *and* his household, and the only one that remained behind is mentioned immediately afterwards. From ch. i. 21 Elkanah can be thought of only together "with his whole house."—The child "*was ministering to the Lord,*" or "serving the Lord." These words express the *whole work* which the growing boy Samuel, conformably to his consecration, had to perform, certain duties connected with the service of God being laid upon him. "Before Eli," that is, under his supervision, and according to his appointment. Ver. 12. The *sons of Eli* were *sons of worthlessness;** their character and conduct forms the sharpest contrast with what they ought to have been before the whole people as highest in position, as children of the High-priestly House. Observe the sharp asyndeton in this short sentence: they *knew not the Lord,* that is, they did not live in the fear of the Lord, they did not trouble themselves about Him; comp. Job xviii. 21. This godlessness and irreligiousness is the source of their moral worthlessness, which is afterwards described. The two together give the religious-moral characteristics of Eli's sons.—Ver. 13. This is not to be rendered: "And the *custom* of the priests with the people was this"—this would certainly require simply וְזֶה *מִשְׁפַּט without הַכֹּהֲנִים ["this is the custom" without "the priests"], comp. Gen. xi. 6 (Böttcher); nor is it: "the right (that is, the assumed right) of the priests in respect to the people was as follows" (Keil), for מִשְׁפָּט ["right"] alone cannot be so understood; but the words are to be connected with the preceding: they troubled themselves not about God, nor about the real, true right of the priests in respect to the people, that is, "about what was the legal due of the priests from the people" (Thenius).

[The construction of this difficult clause adopted by Erdmann (with Vulg., Cahen, Wellhausen, Thenius, and perhaps Sept.) is open to grave objections. The reply to Keil is correct; מִשְׁפָּט cannot well mean "assumed right." The objection to Böttcher's translation (where read וְזֶה מִשְׁפָּטָם instead of Erdmann's וְזֶה מִשְׁפַּט) is forcible in so far as we should expect זֶה to introduce the clause (comp. Deut. xviii. 3); but the possibility of the omission of the pronoun, and of an apposition of the two clauses must be admitted. To the translation of מ׳ by "legal right" Wellhausen properly objects that the גַּם (even) in ver. 15 introduces a graver outrage, and therefore the proceeding described in ver. 13 must be illegal.—But against Erdmann's rendering it is to be said that the meaning assigned to ידע (know) "trouble one's-self about" is rare and difficult; it is found only in poetical passages. The phrase "to know the Lord" occurs, and always in the the sense of intimate sympathetic apprehension; but this sense will not suit the מ׳. Moreover, if מ׳ here means "right" we should expect the prep. מֵאֵת "from" (as Deut. xviii. 3) instead of אֵת

* [For meaning of Heb. *belial,* "worthlessness," see on ch. i. 16.—Tr.].

* [מִשְׁפָּטָם.—Tr.].

"with;" the latter must be retained here, though the former is read in 9 MSS. and in LXX., Syr., Chald. Further, the narrative is, in this construction, introduced very abruptly ("when any man, *etc.*"). מִשְׁפָּט means not only "right," but also "custom, manner;" see 2 Kings xi. 14; Judg. xiii. 12. The "custom" here described was not the legal right, but was in force under, apparently introduced by, the sons of Eli, the priests (הַכֹּ׳); ver. 13 details one imposition of the priests, and a more serious imposition is properly introduced (ver. 15) by "even" (גַּם).—We retain, therefore, the rendering of Eng. A. V. (with Philippson, *Bib. Comm.* and others).—Tr.].

Then follows the statement of the priests' legal right.—The connection required that the people's part in the offering should now be distinctly set forth, in order to put the unseemly conduct of Eli's sons in its true light. Therefore the participle "sacrificing" in connection with the indefinite subject "every man," stands first in absolute construction, like the Lat. Abl. absolute (comp. Gesen. § 145, 2, Rem.), = "when any man offered, then came, *etc.*" Ewald, § 341 *e.*: "If the subject of the circumstantial sentence is wholly undefined, then the mere combination of the participle with the subject suffices to express a possible case (Gen. iv. 15)." Here is vividly portrayed the grasping selfish conduct of the priests in the preparation of the sacrificial meal *after* the offering was presented, which had already become the rule ("so they did to all the Israelites").—But still further. Ver. 15. Even *before* the offering, before (in accordance with the law, Lev. iii. 3-5) the fat was burned that it might be offered to the Lord as the best portion; they committed a robbery on the meat, which they wanted only חַי, that is, raw, fresh, full of juice and strength, in order to roast it. [*Bib. Comm.* points out that vers. 13-15 repeat the Language of the Law, and thus give evidence to its existence. See Lev. vii. 31-35, 23-25, 31; xvii. 5; also Ex. xxix. 28; Deut. xviii. 3. Philippson: "Roast was common in heathen sacrifices, and even now the Orientals do not like to eat boiled meat."—Tr.]. Ver. 16. The remonstrance of the offerer based on the legal regulation, of which they should be the guardians, is set aside. כַּיּוֹם = "at this time, now," as in Gen. xxv. 31; 1 Kings xxii. 5. The Qeri "not" is preferable to the Kethib "to him:" "*no*, but now thou shalt give it;" threats were combined with violent seizure. Rude force was added to lawlessness.—Ver. 17. The "young men" are not the servants of the priests (Keil) but the priests themselves, the sons of Eli. Their arbitrary conduct was "a very great sin before the Lord," because the fat burned on the altar pertained to the Lord, and their legal portion of the sacrifice-meat fell to them only after the burning of the fat. What made their sin so great was the fact that they brought the offerings into contempt with the people, in so far as the wicked conduct of the priests took away in the eyes of the people their true significance as offerings to the Lord. *Minchah* (מִנְחָה) "means here not the meat-offering as the adjunct to the bloody offerings, but the sacrificial gift in general as an offering to the Lord" (Keil). In the succeeding narrative Samuel's "service before the Lord" is contrasted with this wicked conduct of Eli's sons in relation to the offering.

II. Vers. 18-21.—Ver. 18. The "*Ephod*" can mean nothing but a garment resembling in form the High-priest's ephod, consisting of two pieces which rested on the shoulders in front and behind, were joined at the top and held about the body by a girdle. Therefore it is said also: Samuel was *girded* with the ephod, comp. Ex. xxviii. 7, 8. In distinction from the material of the High-priest's ephod, it was made of the same material as the other priestly garments, white linen (בַּד). That the priests then all wore this ephod appears from ch. xxii. 18. It was the sign of the priestly calling, and was worn during the performance of the priestly functions. David was thus clothed, according to 2 Sam. vi. 14, when he brought back the Ark, and in connection with this ceremony performed quasi-priestly functions. As the mention of this *priestly dress* of Samuel is connected expressly and directly with the reference to his calling as *minister* in the Sanctuary *before the Lord*, it is thus intimated that he, called to this life-long service, received therewith an essentially priestly calling. [*Bib. Comm.*: The word *minister* is used in three senses in Scripture: 1) Of the service of both Priests and Levites rendered unto the Lord, Ex. xxviii. 35, *etc.*; 2) of the ministrations of the Levites as rendered to the Priests, Numb. iii. 6; 3) of any service, as that of Joshua to Moses, that of Elisha to Elijah, that of the angels in heaven, 2 Sam. xiii. 17; Ps. ciii. 21, *etc.* The application of it to Samuel accords *most exactly* with his condition as a Levite.—Tr.]. Ver. 19. While the ephod was the High-priestly dress, which the boy received on the part of the Sanctuary (Thenius), the little *meil** (מְעִיל) was his every-day dress, which his mother renewed for him once a year, when she came with her husband to the Sanctuary to present the annual offering. The unbroken connection which the household thus maintained with the Sanctuary prevented any estrangement between the child Samuel and the house of his parents.—The Impf. "made" (תַּעֲשֶׂה) indicates a continued customary action, and thus answers to the Latin tense which is so called in a stricter sense.

Ver. 20. Eli's *blessing*† refers to two things: to the act of consecrating the son to the service of the Lord, and to the compensation which Eli wished the Lord to make for the son who was offered to the Lord. Keil explains the שָׁאַל (asked [Eng. A. V. "lent"]) as 3 pers. singular instead

* [The *meil* was the outer garment worn by kings, nobles and others, probably a loose robe. The High-priest's *meil* was peculiar in shape and color (Ex. xxviii. 31 ff.). *Bib. Comm.*: "The pointed mention of the ephod and robe, taken in connection with his after acts, seems to point to an extraordinary and irregular priesthood to which he was called by God in an age when the provisions of the Levitical law were not yet in full operation."—Tr.]

† וְאָמַר, not וַיֹּאמֶר because the saying as well as the blessing itself (hence also וּבֵרַךְ) was *repeated* every year; and this is expressed by the Perf. consec. (Böttcher). [The two Perfects indicate a *distinction* between the *blessing* and the *saying*, but do not necessarily express repeated action; rather they sum up as complete Eli's action in pronouncing the blessing and uttering the wish."—Tr.]

of 2 pers. singular or plural "from the indefinite form of speech (comp. Ewald, § 249 *b* with § 319 *a*) which the narrator chose because, though it was Hannah who in Eli's presence had obtained Samuel from the Lord by prayer, yet Eli might assume that the father, Elkanah, had shared the wish of his pious wife." But the circumstance which alone permits such change of person, or rather of gender, in the subject, namely, the indefiniteness of the subject as indicated by the context, does not exist here, since such indefiniteness is undoubtedly excluded by ch. i. 27, 28. Böttcher properly takes the verb form with altered points as 3 sing. fem. "she asked."*—The sing. pronoun in "*his* place" (for which we should expect "*their* place") does not require the change of "they went" into "the man went," as Böttcher and Thenius prefer, following the Sept. καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος; the singular suffix (after the plural verb) is explained "by the fact that the place of residence is determined by the husband or owner of the house."

Ver. 21. כִּי is neither with Bunsen to be translated: "When now Jehovah visited Hannah she conceived," nor with Thenius to be complemented by "it came to pass," nor to be referred to "and Eli blessed" (ver. 20), according to the view of Keil, who inserts a sentence ("Eli's word was fulfilled," or "they went home blessed") in order to retain the causal meaning, but it is to be considered as strengthening the following assertion, with reference to the blessing in ver. 20, and = "indeed," "in fact," *immo* [German, *ja, in der that*]. See Ewald, § 310 *c* and § 330 *b*. Comp. Isa. vii. 9; xxxii. 13; Job viii. 6.†—Samuel's growth "before the Lord" indicates not only that he remained in the Sanctuary, but also that (as the condition of his calling) he grew in fellowship of heart and life with God.

III. Vers. 22-26. The chief thing in the content of this section is the description of Eli's conduct towards his sons. But at the same time their worthlessness in relation to the Sanctuary in yet another direction is brought to view. They desecrated the latter not only by the wickedness described in vers. 12-17, but also by their unchaste dealing with the women who served at the Sanctuary. Wherein consisted their service at the door of the Tent of Assembly is not said in Ex. xxxviii. 8, where they are mentioned. They formed a body, which was regularly and formally drawn up (צֹבְאוֹת) at the door of the Tent for the performance of its duty, which consisted "probably in the cleansing of the vessels used in offerings." Since, therefore, they were persons dedicated to the holy God, the wickedness of Eli's sons, who seduced to the service of fleshly lust these persons destined for the service of the Lord, appears in so much the stronger light.—The wickedness of Eli's sons in what pertained to the sanctuary attached itself to the whole people, who were to hold themselves a holy people to the Lord through this Sanctuary and through the offering and persons connected with it.—Eli's conduct in connection with their misdeeds is in the beginning by the words "and Eli was very old" represented as the weakness of old age, not thereby to excuse or justify his slackness, but to explain it.

Ver. 23. The question: **Why do ye such things?** is but a *feeble rebuke* of their gross misdoings. It cannot be translated: "Why do ye according to the *words* which I hear" (Keil)? for the Heb. word (דִּבְרֵיכֶם) cannot mean "reports about you," nor could these reports be termed "evil," since they would be true reports of evil deeds; but the proper rendering is: "Why do ye as these *things?*" that is, such things.* "For I hear of your evil dealings from all this people," that is, those who came to the Sanctuary, and there saw the wickedness.—Ver. 24. "Do not so (אַל) my sons." *Not good* is the "report," or objectively "the thing heard;" this answers to the "evil dealings (or things)." The "I hear" (שֹׁמֵעַ) corresponds to the "report," "thing heard" (שְׁמֻעָה), and [being a particip.—Tr.] shows that it constantly came to his ears. What follows is the explanation of the words: "it is no good report."

The words: "Jehovah's people are made to transgress" (מַעֲבִרִים, *etc.*), express the *guilt* which the sons of Eli incurred by their misdoing towards "the Lord's people." The difficulties in the explanation of the particip. (מ׳ "are causing to transgress") have give occasion to *attempts at alteration*, which, however, are unsatisfactory. "Michaelis' alteration (into מַעֲבִרִים): '*the report which I hear* incidentally (from people passing by) from *God's people*,' is against grammar;" so says Thenius. "But," says Böttcher rightly, "Thenius' own reading (made from Sept. and Arab., and therefore insecure): 'you *plague*, oppress the people of Israel' (מַעֲבִדִים אַתֶּם עַם ׳׳) is wholly without ground. For הֶעֱבִיד means only 'make to *serve*,' '*enslave*,' or 'make to *work*,' plague with work (Ex. i. 13; vi. 5). From the last in the later prophetic style (Isai. xliii. 23) has developed the meaning 'weary,' 'burden,' just as German: *schaffen machen* ['to give trouble,' lit. 'to make to do'], πράγματα παρέχειν ['to cause trouble'], and so always with the idea of 'work' as fundamental. Eli's sons, it is true, robbed and dishonored the people (vers. 13 sqq., 22); but they did not burden them in such a way that our term 'give trouble' would suit. The expression does not come

* Böttcher: "Historically for שָׁאַל must have stood שְׁאֵלָה (so 1 Cod. of Kennicott), this alone being correct and connecting itself immediately with the context. But, because שְׁאֵלָה stood immediately before with the same ה, or because the feminine signification was obvious from the connection, the exceptional form *shaala* (which appears elsewhere also), without the final ה, was written." [The 3 sing. masc. שָׁאַל may be retained here without great difficulty. See "Textual and Grammatical Notes" *in loco*. Chap. i. 27, 28 (cited by Erdmann above) excludes indefiniteness as to the *fact*, but not in the *expression*.—Tr.]

† [Eng. A. V. here follows Sept., reading וַיִּפְקֹד instead of כִּי פָקַד, and this seems the simplest way of taking it: "and Jehovah visited Hannah."—Tr.]

* כְּ has a comparative force, Ges. § 154, 3 sq.—The following אֲשֶׁר is a conjunction, and—not so much ὅτι ["because"] as ὡς ["as"], but, like the latter, goes over into the causative sense; it refers to "such things," and points out the occasion and cause of the rebuke (comp. Ew. § 333, 2 *a* with § 331 *e* 3; Ges. § 155, 2 *d*).

up to the reality, for it is too narrow for the rebuke. And the addition of 'ye' (אַתֶּם) here is both violent, and cannot be inferred from the Arab. text, where it was a necessity of Shemitic construction." The view thus opposed by Böttcher is maintained by Thenius (in his 2d ed. also) to suit the connection perfectly, though, on the other hand, he declares that Ewald's explanation, in which there is no change of text, must be accepted; this latter is held by Böttcher to be the only one permitted by the language and matter, and he gives it thus: "*to send forth a cry* (ה' קוֹל), thence *to cause to be called out*, and *to cause to trumpet forth* (ה' שׁוֹפָר) are common expressions, appropriate to the simplest style, Ex. xxxvi. 6; Lev. xxv. 9; Ezra i. 1; x. 7. Why then should not "send forth a report" (ה' שְׁמוּעָה) be said as well as 'send forth a voice' (ה' קוֹל)? 'The report which (as) I hear, God's people are circulating,' is quite proper; the plu. partcp. is joined to the collective 'people' as in 1 Sam. xiii. 15." To this Thenius properly objects that it is a superfluous statement after ver. 23 ("which I hear from all the people"), and that we should here expect a more significant word. The train of thought requires after the declaration "*not good*," *etc.*, a statement of the ground of Eli's judgment. The usual rendering: "ye make the Lord's people to transgress," satisfies the demands of the connection of thought. Only, as the pers. pron. (אתם, "ye") is wanting, the partcp. must be rendered impersonally: "people make . . . to transgress" (comp. מְשַׁלְּחִים, ch. vi. 3, and אֹמְרִים Ex. v. 16). The objection that the object of the transgression, which is elsewhere always fouud with this verb as exacter determination, is not here expressed (comp. ch. xv. 24; Isa. xxiv. 5; 2 Chron. xxiv. 20; Num. xiv. 41), cannot set aside the meaning: "cause to sin or transgress," "because the exact definition is contained in the context" (Keil). The sin of the sons was, according to the context, very great *before the Lord* (vers. 12-17), but was at the same time committed against the people of the Lord (vers. 13, 22) in reference to their holy calling, and had the destructive effect of bringing the Lord's offering into contempt (ver. 17). The "people of the Lord" not only knew and spoke of the wickedness of Eli's sons, but were made by the latter *partakers of their guilt*, were seduced into transgression of the Law by those who ought to have watched over its fulfillment.

Ver. 25. *Pillel* (פִּלֵּל) is used, in connection with wicked actions, in the sense "to give a decisive judgment," and so between two contending parties, "to compose a strife by judgment;" comp. Ezek. xvi. 52; Ps. cvi. 30. The *elohim*, however, cannot here mean *the judge*, or *the authority* that judges, but *God* is described as He who composes by judging. The sense of Eli's discourse is: "When men sin against men, it is God (of course through the appointed human organs), who restores the disturbed relations by composing the strife; but when we have to do with the relation, not between man and man, but between man and God, when a man sins against God, offends against God's honor, who will interpose to arrange the matter?" Eli sets two things therefore before his sons: 1) that their sin is a sin immediately against God, from which point of view it has been regarded in the whole preceding narration (vers. 12, 17); 2) that the consequent guilt is so great, that divine punishment therefor is certain. [Wordsworth: A man may intercede with God for remission of a penalty due for injury to *himself;* but who shall venture to entreat for one who has outraged the majesty of God?—Tr.]—Eli's weakly mild words were too indefinite and general to check the bold wickedness of his sons. It was too late. They sinned against the Lord "with a high hand" (בְּיָד רָמָה), as it were, with hardened hearts.—**And they hearkened not to the voice of their father.**—As reason of this (כִּי, "because") is stated, "that it pleased God, was God's will, to slay them;" that is, they were in a state of inner hardening, which excluded the subjective condition of salvation from destruction, and so they had already incurred God's unchangeable condemnation. As hardened offenders, they were already appointed by God to death; therefore the word of instruction had no moral effect on them.—Ver. 26. In contrast with them, Samuel is now again presented, as he developed in his childhood as well physically as morally; while the sons of Eli were a horror to God and men, he was well-pleasing to God and men. On הָלַךְ, comp. Ges., § 131, 3, Rem. 3. It is used frequently to express continuance in the sense "advance," "continue," and then also expresses advancing increase, the participial construction being not seldom employed in such cases, as here: "The child Samuel grew constantly in stature and goodness." [See Luke ii. 52.—Tr.]

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. Since Eli's judgeship rested on his high-priestly dignity, the *High-priestship*, thus connected with the judicial office, had so much the higher calling to establish the theocratic unity of the people with their centre, the national sanctuary at Shiloh. But, in the person of the weak Eli, it showed itself incapable of fulfilling this calling. The godless priesthood, represented by the sons of Eli, corrupted the inner religious-moral life of the people, whose external centre and theocratic unity were in the Sanctuary. The priesthood could no longer fulfil its calling of mediating between God and His people, because its representatives, lacking the religious-moral conditions of the calling, were unworthy of it; they were not servants of God, but servants of sin.

2. The sins of Eli's sons were a symptom of their spiritual heart-hardening and ruin in alienation from God and in immorality. They sinned with "a high hand," boldly, presumptuously (comp. Num. xv. 22-31). To this internal judgment of hardening answered as necessary consequence the judgment of their rejection by God, which was a thing determined on in God's will, *because* they knew nothing of *God* and His law (ver. 12). Their crime against the divinely established holy ordinances and the sanctuary, the visible sign of God's abode with His people,

was at the same time a crime against the people of the Lord, and culminated in the crime against God Himself, in which indeed was its root.

3. Samuel, though not a priest, but only a Levite, is (by his repeated designation as "servant of the Lord" (vers. 11, 18), and by the reference to his priestly clothing) contrasted with the representation of the official priesthood as God's chosen instrument for *truly* fulfilling, in and by the prophetic calling which was to take the place of the priesthood that mediated between God and His people, the *priestly mission*,* to fulfil which the existing priestly race had shown itself both powerless and unworthy. The condition of this theocratic calling of Samuel, the earnest, personal fellowship of life with the Lord, is pointed out in vers. 21, 26. The life of the youth, who was chosen and called by the Lord to restore the theocracy, develops itself in the service of the sanctuary before the Lord in conformity to his divine mission, in order that some day he may become in place of the desecrated sanctuary the living personal centre of the theocratic national life, and in place of the corrupted priesthood the consecrated organ of God's new revelations for His people.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 12. STARKE: Where the true fear of God is lacking in the *heart*, there ungodliness prevails in the *life*, and thereby the heart reveals itself. S. SCHMID: It is a bad state of things, when those who teach others the fear of God, do not fear God themselves.—J. LANGE: Preachers should most carefully guard against scandal, and earnestly strive to pursue a course of life which shall be not merely without offence, but also edifying, 1 Tim. iv. 11.—STARKE: He who in the office of teacher seeks only his own—namely, how he may become rich and have a good time—but not that which belongs to God and Jesus Christ, is a false prophet, a thief, and a hireling. Mark that, you who bear the vessels of the Lord, Phil. ii. 20, 21; iv. 17; 2 Cor. xii. 14; 1 Pet. v. 2 sqq. [The misconduct of these leaders of worship may well suggest lessons for Christian ministers; but it should never be forgotten that the Christian minister corresponds much more nearly to the Old Testament *prophet* than to the *priest*, and that all Christians are priests, 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9; Rev. i. 6; v. 10.—TR.]

Ver. 16. STARKE: When hearers see something bad in him who has the care of their souls, they should duly remind him of it, and should not approve and commend his bad deeds, much less imitate him therein.

Ver. 17. STARKE: Nobody makes more Atheists than godless teachers, and even if the people still remember so much as to do according to their words and not their works, yet they retain a powerful influence upon the furtherance of godlessness. That wicked teachers with their godless life make great their damnation, is beyond dispute; but it is irrational to infer from this that there is no such thing as religion. ["The sin of the young men was very great" is the text of a sermon by WESLEY (*Sermon* CIX., Vol. II. p. 368) on the question "whether God ever did bless the ministry of ungodly men."—TR.]

Ver. 18. STARKE: And so he (Samuel) was a right pious lad; for such piety is more acceptable to God than when one leads a good life among only pious people, since there is a greater victory and greater fidelity in living piously among the wicked. Comp. Enoch's example, Gen. v. 24; vi. 9.

Ver. 19. DAECHSEL: Petty little histories, cries unbelief. What matters it whether one knows that Samuel had a little coat or not! Holy Scripture is not written for the wise, but for child-souls, and a child-like soul does not doubt that even the little coat which Hannah prepared for her Samuel has its history. If I think of Hannah as every year sewing this coat at her home in Ramah, I know that at every stitch a prayer for her Samuel rose up to the throne of the Lord.—The coat which she was sewing would remind her that she had given her Samuel to the Lord; and when the coat was ready, and she brought it to Shiloh, then every time with the coat she anew gave Samuel to her God, and said: I give him to the Lord again for his whole life, because he was obtained from the Lord by prayer.

Ver. 21. STARKE: Whoever gives to God what is God's, to him God also gives what his heart desires.—OSIANDER: Nothing is better invested than what is given to God the Lord and to His service; for He richly repays it all.—DAECHSEL: When our faithful God accepts from us poor creatures an offering of love, He takes it only to give it back five-fold, a hundred fold, and a thousand-fold; from His fulness we receive grace for grace. Look at our Hannah! It was grace, that the Lord taught her to pray for Samuel; grace, that He gave her the promise; grace, that He made her willing to dedicate Samuel to him; but what shall we say of the fact that in place of the one child whom He had caused to be given to Himself, the Lord gave her five children, three sons and two daughters? When we in His service do for Him the least thing out of love, it is not enough that He gives to the act itself such blessedness, but, consciously or unconsciously to us, He crowns such an act with a rich blessing of grace, and this grace is completed when He blesses us with the greatest of all blessings, eternal life.—[Vers. 22–25.] STARKE: O, how often do pious parents, by indulging their wicked children, plait a scourge for their old backs! [HALL: I heard Eli sharp enough to Hannah, upon but a suspicion of sin, and now how mild I find him to the notorious crimes of his own. The case is altered with the persons. With all the authority of an Oriental father, a high-priest, and a judge, he was solemnly bound to do more than mildly censure his sons, chap. iii. 13.—TR.]

Ver. 25. CRAMER: The sins of the first table are much weightier and more perilous than the sins of the second table.—OSIANDER: Let no one sin purposely or wilfully and heap sins upon sins; for if he does, the door of grace is at last closed to him, and he finds no more place for repentance.—STARKE: The purpose of God was not the cause of their disobedience, but their disobedience was a sign that they

* [This statement is liable to misconception. The prophet could never take the place of the priest. The priest represented the idea of *atonement by blood*, a universal, fundamental religious fact; the prophet expounded the *spirituality* of God's law and service. These complementary offices were equally necessary, and existed till they both culminated in Jesus Christ.—TR.]

were now ripe for destruction, and that the righteous purpose of God in their case should now soon be executed.

Ver. 26. STARKE: The best way to make ourselves agreeable and beloved among men is to seek to please God in Christ, act according to our conscience, and lead an exemplary life.—S. SCHMID: Whoever uses the grace of God aright, to him God gives more and more grace.—DAECHSEL: Our history is throughout a strong, firm consolation for parental hearts—for those who have to give back to the Lord in death a dear child which He has given to them in birth, for He can otherwise rejoice and bless them (vers. 20 sq.); and also for those who have to let their sons and daughters go out into the wicked world, full of evil examples and corrupting influences, for He can even then shield and preserve their children, and carry them on in faith and godliness (vers. 21–26).

Vers. 18–26. *Young Samuel the pattern of a pious life in youth in the service of the Lord:* 1) *Planted and rooted* in the soil of the early habit during childhood of consecrating himself to the Lord, vers. 18, 19; 2) *Growing and increasing* in the fear of the Lord under the care of godly parents and teachers, vers. 19–21; 3) *Preserved and proved* amid the temptations and influences of an evil world, vers. 22–25; 4) *Blessed* with favor in the sight of God and man.

Vers. 23–25. *The judgment against obduracy in sin against the Lord:* 1) *Wherein* is it *founded?* (*a*) In persistent, conscious sinning on against the Lord in spite of divine and human warning. (*b*) In the holy, unchangeable will of God, who does not suffer Himself to be mocked. 2) *How is it executed?* (*a*) In that God gives up the sinner to the service of sin from one degree to another. (*b*) In that the punitive divine justice gives over the sinner to the destruction to which he has condemned himself.

[Vers. 12–25. On wicked children of pious parents. 1) The *number* of such cases is often greatly exaggerated, because men are surprised at them, and notice, and remember; but it is in fact sadly great—in the Scripture histories—in our own observation. 2) The probable *causes* of this. (*a*) Piety is not properly hereditary—in what sense it is, and in what sense it is not. (*b*) Pious parents may, out of mistaken kindness, improperly indulge, and but feebly restrain—as Eli. (*c*) In other cases, they are too strict and severe. Application—to parents—to the children of the pious.—TR.]

Ver. 26. *The fruit of a godly life:* 1) The gracious approval of the Lord; 2) Recognition by God-fearing men.

FIFTH SECTION.

The prophecy of a Man of God of the divine judgment on Eli's house and of the calling of a faithful priest.

CHAPTER II. 27–36.

27 AND there came a man of God[1] unto [to] Eli and said unto [to] him, Thus saith
the Lord [Jehovah], Did I plainly appear [reveal myself] unto [to] the house of
thy father when they were in Egypt in Pharaoh's house [in servitude[2] to the house
28 of Pharaoh]? And did I choose [I chose[3]] him [it] out of all the tribes of Israel
to be my priest [to do priestly service to me], to offer[4] upon my altar, to burn incense, to wear an ephod before me? [*om.* ?], and did I give [I gave] unto [to] the
house of thy father all the offerings made by fire [the fire-offerings] of the children
29 of Israel? [*om.* ?]. Wherefore kick ye at [trample ye under foot] my sacrifice
and at [*om.* at] mine [my] offering which I have commanded in *my* habitation,[5]
and honorest thy sons above me to make yourselves fat with the chiefest of all the
30 offerings [the best of every offering] of Israel my people?[6] Wherefore [Therefore]
the Lord [Jehovah] God of Israel saith, I said indeed[7] that thy house and the house

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 27. Chald. "a prophet of Jehovah."—TR.]

[2] [Ver. 27. לְ often expresses possession, and is here so rendered by Chald. and Sept.—TR.]

[3] [Ver. 28. The following וָאֶתְּנָה makes it better not to carry on the interrogation here. Erdmann: "I chose it (thy house) to perform priestly service."—TR.]

[4] [Ver. 28. The Heb. form here may be Qal ("ascend") or Hiphil ("offer") but the sense is the same in both cases.—TR.]

[5] [Ver. 29. See Exeg. Notes.—TR.]

[6] [Ver. 29. The לְ is probably repetition from the last letter of the preceding word; see Josh. x. 21 for similar case.—TR.]

[7] [Ver. 30. "Indeed" is merely intensive, Heb. Infin. Absol.—TR.]

of thy father should walk before me for ever; but now the Lord saith [saith
Jehovah], Be it far from me; for them that honor me I will honor, and they that
31 despise me shall be lightly esteemed. Behold, the days come that I will cut off
thine arm, and the arm of thy father's house, [*ins.* so] that there shall not be an
32 old man in thine house. And[8] thou shalt see an enemy in *my* habitation in all *the*
wealth which *God* shall give Israel [thou shalt see distress of house in all that does
33 good to Israel]; and there shall not be an old man in thy house for ever. And
the man of thine whom I shall not cut off [And I will not cut off every man of
thine[9]] from my altar *shall be* [*om.* shall be], to consume thine eyes, and to grieve
thine [thy] heart; and all the increase of thine [thy] house shall die in the flower
34 of their age.[10] And this shall be a [the] sign unto [to] thee, that [*ins.* which] shall
come upon thy two sons, Hophni and Phinehas: in one day they shall die both of
35 them. And I will raise me up a faithful priest, *that* [who] shall do according to
that which is in my heart and in my mind [soul], and I will build him a sure[11]
36 house, and he shall walk before my anointed for ever. And it shall come to pass
that every one that is left in thy house shall come and crouch to him for a piece[12]
of silver and a morsel of bread, and shall say, Put me, I pray thee, into one of the
priests' offices, that I may eat a piece of bread.

[8] [Ver. 32. On the text of this verse see Exeg. Notes.—Tr.]
[9] [Ver. 33. See Exeg. Notes.—Tr.]
[10] [Ver. 33. Lit. "shall die men;" Sept. "by the sword of men," which Wellhausen prefers, but see Exeg. Notes.—Tr.]
[11] [Ver. 35. The Heb. word is the same as that rendered "faithful" just before.—Tr.]
[12] [Ver. 36. More exactly "a small piece;" Erdmann: *eine Bettelmünze*, "a beggar's coin."—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 27. The "*man of God*" (for the expression comp. Deut. xxxiii. 1; Judg. xiii. 6) who appears here is undoubtedly to be regarded as a prophet, both from this title, which marks him as standing in a specific relation to God, and from the introduction of his address: "Thus saith the Lord." This is, however, not the *first* mention of a *prophet* after *Moses* (Thenius); against this are Judg. iv. 14; vi. 8.—[*Bib. Comm.:* "The term (man of God) is applied to Moses in Deut. xxxiii. 1; Josh. xiv. 6; and to different prophets upwards of forty times in Judg., Sam. and Kings, most frequently in the latter. In the Prophets it occurs only once (Jer. xxxv. 4). It occurs six or seven times in Chron., Ezra and Neh., and in the inscription of Ps xc., and nowhere else in the Old Testament. The sudden appearance of a man of God, the only prophet of whom mention is made since Ju. vi. 8, without name, or any notice of his country, is remarkable."—Tr.]—**Thus saith the Lord.**—Called and commissioned hereto by the Lord, he is nothing but His instrument; what he says is the very word of the Lord.—**Did I reveal myself?**—The interrog. particle (הֲ) stands here to strengthen the reality of the fact treated of, a question being introduced to which an affirmative reply is a matter of course, where in German [and in English] a *not* must be inserted. Comp. Jer. xxxi. 20; Job xx. 4; Ges. § 153, 2. The Inf. Abs. (נִגְלֹה) shows the feeling of the question, and strengthens the assurance or assertion contained in it. By *Eli's father's house* we cannot understand Ithamar and his family, since a divine revelation to them in Egypt is out of the question; it is rather the family of Aaron (from whom Eli descended through Ithamar), as the high-priestly house. Aaron and his four sons, Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, when they were in Egypt, "*belonged* to Pharaoh's house," were its *subjects, property* (לְבֵית פּ׳); the suffix ־ָם (when *they* were) refers not to the children of Israel, but to "the house of thy father."

During the Egyptian bondage Aaron received the divine revelations by which he was called along with Moses to be God's instrument for the redemption of His people; and with Moses he received the command to institute the feast of the Passover (Ex. iv. 14 sqq., 27; xii. 1, 43). These revelations were the preparation and foundation for the calling of Aaron and his house to the high-priesthood.—[So far as the *calling* was concerned, the *house of Aaron* and the *house of Eli* were identical. Hence Eli is in this discourse identified with Aaron as to his *privileges*, but distinguished from the whole house as to his *sin* and its *punishment*.—Tr.]

Ver. 28. [Erdmann renders: "I chose it (the house of thy father) to perform priestly service."—Tr.]*

How that house (Aaron and his sons) were formally called and appointed to the priestly office is circumstantially related in Ex. xxviii., xxix.

* *Textual and Grammatical.*—The Inf. Abs. בָּחֹר stands for the Verb. fin., as a Verb. fin. has preceded in the same sentence (Ges., § 131, 4 *a*). But the interrog. הֲ does not extend to this Inf. Abs., which stands for the Perf., and makes the discourse absolute.—אֹתוֹ is better referred to בֵּית than to אָבִיךָ, on account of the following "tribes." But then we must read with Böttcher and Thenius לְכַהֵן instead of לְכֹהֵן, "as agreeing better with the preceding בֵּית and the succeeding Inf." (Böttcher). So the Sept. ἱερατεύειν. Comp. Ex. xxxi. 10.—לַעֲלוֹת is contracted from לְהַעֲלוֹת. See Deut. i. 33; 2 Sam. xviii. 3; Eccl. v. 5.

Comp. especially Ex. xxviii. 1; xxix. 9, 30, 44, with Lev. viii. 1 sq. and Num. xviii.—The *priestly service* is described in three grades, corresponding to the three divisions of the Sanctuary: 1) "*to offer* on my altar*," where the altar of burnt-offering with its service is meant; 2) "*to burn incense.*" Incense had to be burned daily. The incense-offering alone is named, and represents the other offerings as the indication of the priestly service in the *Holy Place*, Ex. xxx. 8; 3) "*to wear the ephod before me.*" The high-priest wore the ephod† when he went officially into the *Most Holy* place to represent the people before God, Ex. xxviii. 12, 29, 30.—**And I gave to the house of thy father**, *etc.*—The divine wages for these priestly services is the maintenance which the priests derived from the offerings. The "firings" (fire-offerings, אִשֵּׁי בּ׳) are the same as "the firing and the firings of the Lord" (Lev. i. 9; ii. 10; Deut. xviii. 1) in the offerings, and so are the things offered. According to Num. xviii. 20; Deut. x. 9; xviii. 1, the Levites, and therefore the whole priesthood, received no inheritance in land; their support was provided for by the portions of the offerings appointed them by law, that is, all sacrificial gifts, so far as they were not burnt in offering the sacrifice, Lev. vi. 7; Num. xviii.

Ver. 29. In the preceding verses (27, 28) reference is made to the favor which had been shown the family of Eli in their selection and calling to the service of priests in the Sanctuary, and their maintenance with the offerings is mentioned as proof of the Lord's care for His servants; there the question (ver. 27) was introduced by the simple interrog. sign (הֲ); here the more sharply toned question with "why" (לָמָּה) portrays in distinct contrast the wicked conduct of the priests: **Why do ye trample under foot?** *etc.*—"Sacrifice and offering" (זֶבַח וּמִנְחָה) is a "general designation for all altar-offerings" (Keil). בָּעַט "is in Aram. first *tread* (Heb. דרך), and might thence (as בוס, דרך, Judg. v. 23; Prov. xxvii. 7) like 'tread' in many languages figuratively mean *to treat with contempt*" (Böttcher). מָעוֹן, the "dwelling," in pregnant sense is the Tabernacle, as the Lord's dwelling-place in the midst of His people. Though the word has not elsewhere in itself this meaning, yet it follows here and in ver. 32 from the connection, which without difficulty permits the same addition that we find in Ps. xxvi. 8, "of thy house." There is no need therefore here to suppose (with Thenius) either a wrong reading or in general anything superfluous, particularly not the latter, because the Lord's abode with His people was in fact the scene of the priests' enormities, and their guilt thus appeared so much the greater. מָעוֹן is Accus. of place "in the dwelling" (=בֵּית "in the house"). Böttcher proposes as a "faultless text" א׳ צִוִּיתִים עָוֹן, "why do ye trample under foot, . . . what I commanded them, *sinfully*," where the suffix "them" refers to the Israelites (ver. 28), and עָוֹן, "sin," is taken in the sense of בְּעָוֹן, "in sin," which is found in Ps. li. 7. But according to the preceding explanation there is no need for such a change, apart from the fact "that the '*sinfully*' precisely speaking is already contained in the 'trample *under foot*'" (Thenius). He says: "why do *ye* trample," *etc.*, because Eli was partaker in the guilt of his sons; because he, not only as father towards sons, but also as high-priest towards them as priests, was weakly lacking in the proper chastisement and in the enjoined holy strictness. Eli ought to have opposed his sons as a zealous contender for the Lord's honor; since he did not do this, he not only made himself partaker of their guilt, but *honored his sons before the Lord*, more than the Lord, because he spared them, and showed unseasonable paternal gentleness. In the plu. pron. "make *yourselves* fat," Eli's guilt is again referred to; what they did, namely, that they took (ver. 15) the first (רֵאשִׁית) of the offering before the best of the offering (מִנְחָה) was presented to the Lord by burning it in the fire of the altar, that he did along with them; *they* made themselves fat. The *wickedness* of Eli and his sons in connection with the offering is also put here in two-fold form, namely, against God ("*my* offering"), and against the people as the people of the Lord (all the offerings of Israel, *my* people).* After the reference to the *guilt* follows now the *judgment*, the announcement of *punishment*, which applies to Eli as well as to his sons and his whole house.

Ver. 30. אָמַרְתִּי=I *had* said.—**The house of thy father** in connection with "thy house," indicates the whole priestly connection in all its branches from Aaron down, to whom with his sons the same expression in ver. 27 refers. For this reason, if for no other, because "the house of thy father" must mean the same here as in ver. 27, we must set aside the view that here only Ithamar's family is meant, to which the high-priesthood passed from Eleazar's family, and to which Eli belonged. But also the expression: **should walk before me for ever**, is in conflict with this view. The "walking before the Lord" would be understood in too narrow a sense, on the one hand, if it were restricted to the entrance of the high-priest into the Holy of Holies, and in too wide a sense, on the other hand, if it were regarded as a general description of a pious walk before God, as in Gen. xvii. 1. Rather it points to the life *in priestly service before the Lord* promised to the house of Aaron *for ever* (Ex. xxix. 9). The promise of the "covenant of an everlasting priesthood" was renewed to Phinehas, the son of Eleazar (Num. xxv. 18) *for his zeal for the Lord's honor*. This fact and its motive contribute essentially to the explanation of what here follows. The "and now" introduces a declaration opposed to that promise, not in the sense that the latter is annulled, but in reference to its non-fulfilment for those in whom the condition of its fulfilment was lacking.—**Far**

* [The Germ. has *steigen*, "ascend," error for *opfern*, "offer."—Tr.]

† [Germ. *achselkleid*, "shoulder-dress," "amice."—Tr.]

* לְעַמִּי "is periphrasis for the Gen., and is chosen in order to make the 'my people' more prominent" (Keil). On this periphrasis of the Gen. see Ew. Gr. § 292, *a*. 3.—[But this does not apply here. See Textual Notes in loco.—Tr.]

be it from me, that is, this promise shall not be fulfilled unless the condition be fulfilled which is expressed in the words: **Those that honor me I will honor.**—According to the priests' attitude towards God the Lord in their whole walk will be His attitude towards them in respect to the fulfilment of His promise.

Vers. 31, 32. The *general truth* of the last words in ver. 30, which emphasize in the distinctest manner the ethical condition of the exercise of the holy sacerdotal office in the priest's bearing towards God, *is applied to Eli and his house* in ver. 31, and contains the *standard* by which he with his sons is *judged*. **I will cut off thy arm.**—The "arm" signifies *might, power*, Ps. x. 15; Job xxii. 9. "There shall *not be an old man* in thy house." Thus will be shown that the strength of the family and the house is broken; for strength is shown in reaching a great age. No one in Eli's house shall attain a great age. This supposes that sickliness will early consume its members. "On the aged rested the consideration and power of families" (Böttcher). As the *house of Eli* will perish, so will also the *house of God* suffer affliction (ver. 32). הִבִּיט always means to look with astonishment or attention (Böttcher, Num. xii. 8; Isa. xxxviii. 11; Ps. x. 14); צַר is only "oppressor" or "enemy," and is not to be rendered "rival" or "adversary," as Aquila (ἀντίζηλος) and Jerome (*æmulus*), and also Luther and De Wette give it; מָעוֹן "dwelling" is here to be understood of the dwelling-place of *God*, not of Eli. From these meanings it follows that Samuel cannot be here referred to, since he was not an enemy of Eli, nor the installation of Zadok in Abiathar's place (1 Ki. ii. 27), for Zadok was not Abiathar's enemy. Something must be meant which Eli lived to see with astonishment or consternation in the house of the Lord, and it can therefore only be the oppression of the house by the oppressor or enemy who met Israel in the person of the Philistines, carried away the ark, and thus robbed the Lord's house of its heart. We do not need therefore to alter the text to "rock of refuge" (צוּר מָעוֹז), as Böttcher proposes. "In all which" (בְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר) is not to be rendered with De Wette "during the whole time which." In יֵיטִב "shall do good" we must not supply a י as name of Jehovah (Kennicott), nor, as is commonly done, make Jehovah the subject (De Wette, Keil, *etc.*). "There is no reason why we should not take "all which" itself as unpersonal subject; precisely where ה׳ has an unpersonal subject, it has, as here, a simple Acc. after it, Pr. xv. 13, 20; xvii. 22; Ecc. xx. 9, while, with a personal subject, a preposition follows, Ex. i. 20; Num. x. 32; Judg. xvii. 13" (Böttcher). The affliction of God's house from the loss of the Ark remained, while under the lead of Samuel there came blessing to the people. This is the fulfilment of this prophecy in reference to the affliction of *God's dwelling*. "*Not an old man*" is repetition of the threat in ver. 31, and return of the discourse to the judgment on *Eli's house*. "All the days" [Eng. A. V. *for ever*], for ever, that is, as long as his family existed. [Both text and translation of ver. 32 offer great difficulties. Vat. Sept. omits it. Al. Sept. and Theod.: "Thou shalt see strength" (κραταίωμα), *etc.* The Syr. and Arab.: "and (not) one who holds a sceptre in thy dwelling," which involves a totally different text. Targ. has "thou shalt see the affliction which will come on a man of thy house in the sins which ye have committed in the house of my sanctuary." The omission in Vat. Sept. was probably occasioned by the similar endings of vers. 31 and 32; the other versions and all the MSS. contain the verse, one MS. only of De Rossi giving מָעוֹז, "strength," instead of מָעוֹן, "dwelling." We must therefore retain the Heb. text, and explain the repetition of the last clause as intended to give emphasis to the statement in question. But, as צַר frequently means "distress," and as the course of thought here suggests affliction for Eli's house rather than for God's, it is better to render: "thou shalt see distress of dwelling in all that brings prosperity to Israel," the contrast being between the national prosperity and his personal affliction, which would thus exclude him from the national rejoicing, and so from the evidence of the divine favor. And we may regard the latter clause of the verse: "there shall not be an old man," *etc.*, as defining the "affliction" which is here brought out as a punishment additional to the "weakness" of ver. 31.—Tr.]

Ver. 33. Böttcher declares De Wette's explanation: "and I will not let thee lack a single man," to be incorrect, and Thenius' reference to the definite *one* "Ahitub" (xiv. 3; xxii. 20) to be without ground, and then remarks (on וְאִישׁ לֹא): "There remains no other course but to regard it as an infrequent, but not unexampled exceptional case. In Heb., as is well known, a negative in a sentence with אִישׁ ("man") and כל ("all"), whether it stand before or after, negatives these words not alone, but in connection with the whole sentence, and thus לֹא אִישׁ, אַל אִישׁ mean not "not every one," but "no one," and so too אִישׁ לֹא, אִישׁ אַל, Ex. xvi. 19; xxxiv. 3; Lev. xviii. 6. But when the accent falls on the word expressive of universality by an adversative particle, as here (וְאִישׁ), the following negation may affect *this* word alone, as in Num. xxiii. 13. Accordingly we render here: "Yet I will *not* cut off *every one* from thee." The following words: **to consume thine eyes and to grieve thy heart**, or "that I may consume," *etc.*, mark the highest degree of punishment which would befal Eli but for the limitation contained in the words "not every man." Thenius refers this limitation specially to Ahitub, son of Phinehas, and brother of Ichabod, against which Keil justly remarks that it cannot be proved from xiv. 3 and xxii. 20 that he was the only one who survived of Eli's house.*—The following words: **the great majority or mass** shall die **as men**, not only answer to the repeated threat in vers. 31, 32, that there should be no old man in the house, but at

* Böttcher: לַאֲדִיב is for לַדְאִיב—לְהַדְאִיב, one of the numerous clerical errors in these books.—[It is by no means clear that there is a clerical error here, since we may suppose a stem דאב—אדב as נאק—אנק.—Tr.]

the same time explain the declaration of ver. 31: "I will break thine arm;" for "men" (אֲנָשִׁים) indicates the *power* and *strength* of the house, and is contrasted with "old man" (Luther: "when they have become men;" Van Ess: "in mature age").—On 'מ' ב, "multitude," "majority," not "offspring," comp. 1 Chron. xii. 29; 2 Chron. xxx. 18.—[Sept.: "And every survivor of thy house shall fall by the sword of men." Vulg.: "and the great part of thy house shall die when they attain the age of men." Targ.: "and all the multitude of thy house shall be slain young." Syr.: "and all the pupils (so Castle renders *marbith*) of thy house shall die men." Philippson: "and all the increase of thy house shall die as men." The Eng. A. V. probably gives the sense. The adj. "all" does not suit the rendering "multitude," which Targ. and Erdmann adopt. In regard to the first clause of the verse, the rendering of Eng. A. V. seems to be possible, that is, the taking לֹא אִישׁ as indef. rel. clause. Erdmann regards the reservation of the "man" as a limitation of the punishment ("consume, grieve"); Eng. A. V. better, with most expositors, as an element of the punishment. Mendoza (in Poole's Synopsis): "I will take from thee the high-priesthood, which thou hast by privilege; I will give thee or thy descendants the priesthood of the second order, which thou hadst by hereditary right." Grotius: "They shall live that they may be the greatest grief to thee."—Long afterwards this curse was held to cling to the family of Eli. Gill cites a saying of the Talmud that there was a family in Jerusalem the men of which did not live to be more than eighteen years old, and Johanan ben Zacchai being asked the reason of this, replied that they were perhaps of the family of Eli.—Sept. has "*his* eyes" and "*his* soul," instead of *thy;* but there is no good ground for altering the Heb. text.—Tr.]

Ver. 34. The fact announced, *the death of his two sons in one day* (iv. 11), was to be a *sign* to Eli, who lived to see it, that this threat affecting his whole house should be fulfilled. The realization of this threat began with that event. Not all of Eli's descendants indeed perished in this judgment, and among his immediate posterity were some who filled the office of priest, namely, Phinehas' son, Ahitub; Ahitub's sons, Ahiah (xiv. 3, 18) and Ahimelech (xxii. 9, 11, 20); Ahimelech's son, Abiathar (xxii. 20). Ahiah and Abiathar filled the high-priestly office. But Ahimelech and "all his father's house, the priests, who were at Nob," were hewn off from Eli's family-tree. And Abiathar, Ahimelech's son, who escaped that butchery (xxii. 19), and as a faithful adherent of David enjoyed the dignity of high-priest, was deposed from his office by Solomon. The office of high-priest passed now forever from Ithamar's family, and went over to Eleazar's, to which Zadok belonged; the latter from now on was sole high-priest, while hitherto Abiathar had exercised this office along with him.—Thus was to be fulfilled the *negative* part of the prophetic announcement (vers. 31–34): gradually Eli's house went down in respect to the majority of its members [better, in all its increase.—Tr.]; the office of high-priest, which the surviving members for some time filled, was at last taken away from it altogether.

Ver. 35 sqq. Now follows the *positive* part of the prophecy.—**But I will raise me up a faithful priest.**—The priestly office, as a divine institution, remains, though those that fill it perish because they are unworthy, and because their life contradicts its theocratic meaning, and therefore falls under the divine punishment. The "faithful priest" is, in the first place, to be understood in contrast with Eli and his sons, to whom the above declaration of punishment was directed. We may distinguish the following facts in the announcement of this *priest of the future*, who is to assume the theocratic-priestly position between God and His people in place of Eli and his house: 1) he is to be *raised up by God* directly, that is, not merely called and chosen, but (according to the exact meaning of the word) *set up;* his priestly *position* is to be historically fixed and assigned by God directly and in an extraordinary manner; 2) he will be a *faithful* priest, that is, will not merely be in keeping with the end and meaning of his calling, but, in order to this, will be and remain personally the Lord's own in true piety and in firm, living faith, constantly and persistently devoted to the Lord his God, and seeking only His honor; 3) he will do, act, *according to the norm of the divine will;* as faithful priest of God, he knows what is *in God's heart and soul*, he knows His *thoughts and counsels;* these will be the rule by which (כַּאֲשֶׁר) he will act as a man of God, as a servant *after his heart;* 4) **and I will build him a sure house**, his family will continue as one well-pleasing to me and blessed, and will not perish like thine—this shall be the *reward* as well as the result of his faithfulness; 5) **he shall walk before my anointed for ever.** The "anointed" is the *theocratic king*, whom the Lord will call. Walking before Him denotes the most cordial *life-fellowship* with Him. In this reference of the prophetic announcement to the "*anointed of the Lord*" is expressed the same expectation of a theocratic kingdom as in the close of Hannah's song.

In ver. 36 is added another feature in the portraiture of the faithful priest: in this close connection with the kingdom, he will occupy so exalted, honorable and mighty a position over against the fallen house of Eli, that the needy and wretched survivors of that house will be dependent on him for existence and support.—On the כֹּל before הַנּוֹתָר, where, on account of the following Article, it signifies *all, whole*, comp. Ges., § III., 1 Rem., Ew., § 290 c. "All the rest, all that remains." The אֲגוֹרַת כֶּסֶף is "a small silver coin collected by begging" (Keil). The lower the remains of Eli's house sink even to beggary, the higher will the "faithful, approved priest," of whom the prophet here speaks, stand. In the immediate future of the theocratic kingdom he will see far beneath him those of Eli's house who are still priests in humble dependence on him.

This prophecy found its *fulfillment* from the stand-point of historical exposition in *Samuel*. That the author of our Books had *him* in view in his account of the man of God's announcement

is clear from the narration immediately following in ch. iii.; here the voice of the *divine call* comes to the child Samuel at the same time with the revelation imparted to him of the *judgment* against the house of Eli. He is indeed expressly called by the divine voice to be *prophet*; his first prophetic duty, which he performs as God's organ, is the announcement of the judgment on Eli in the name of the Lord; it is true, it is said of him in ver. 20, that he was known in all Israel to be faithful and confirmed (נֶאֱמָן) as a prophet. But the summary statement of his prophetical vigor and work in vers. 19-21, in which the epithet "*faithful, confirmed*," points back to the same expression in ii. 35, is connected with the reference to *Shiloh* and the constant revelations there, which had begun with the one made to Samuel; by the express reference to Shiloh Samuel's prophetic character and work are at the same time presented under the *sacerdotal* point of view. An essential element of the calling of *priest* was instruction in the Law, the announcement of the divine will (Lev. x. 11; Deut. xxxiii. 10), and Mal. ii. 7, expressly declares the duty of the priest in these words: "the priest's lips shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the law from his mouth, for he is a messenger of heaven;" and so that prophecy of a faithful priest is all the more fulfilled in Samuel (whose words to the people, iii. 19-21, had the pure and the practical word of God in the Law for their content), because the priesthood of his time had proved itself unworthy and unable to fulfil this calling. The further sacred priestly acts which Samuel performed (iii. 19-21), and the mediating position between God and the people as advocate and intercessor expressly ascribed to him in vii. 5 characterize him as the *faithful, approved* priest who is announced here in vers. 35, 36. The other single traits in the picture suit Samuel. In the list of theocratic instruments of the succeeding period there is none that surpasses him; he surpasses them all so far, that our gaze fixes itself on him in seeking for a realization of this announcement in connection with the fulfilment of the threat against Eli and his house. Samuel's bearing and *conduct* is everywhere such that the declaration "he shall *do* according to what is in my heart and soul," is verified in no other theocratic-prophetic and priestly person so eminently as in him. A *sure house* the Lord built him according to 1 Chron. vi. 33; xxv. 4, 5. His grandson was Heman "the singer, the king's seer in the words of God," father of fourteen sons and three daughters. The intimate relation of Samuel to the theocratic kingdom under Saul and David, the Lord's anointed kings, is an obvious fulfilment of the prophecy "he shall walk before my anointed for ever." The raising up of the fore-announced priest was to follow immediately on the punishment of Eli and his house. In point of fact Samuel steps into the gap in the priesthood which that judgment made as priestly and high-priestly mediator between God and the people, as is shown by the passages cited and by the whole character of his work. By the corruption of its traditional representatives the hereditary priesthood had come to be so at variance with its theocratic significance and mission, that the fulfilment of this mission could be attained, in this great crisis in the development of Israel's history into the theocratic kingdom, only in an extraordinary way, through direct divine calling, by such an instrument as Samuel. The statement, in the concluding words, of the walking of the faithful priest before the Lord's anointed is fulfilled exactly (according to the above explanation) in Samuel's relation to this kingdom.—*It is held by some* that the prophecy in vers. 30-36, (compared with 1 Kings ii. 27, and Joseph. V. 11, 5; VIII. 1, 3), refers to the transition of the priestly dignity from the house of Ithamar to the house of Eleazar, and therefore that this prophecy, in whole or in some parts, was composed in or after the time of Solomon, (De Wette, *Einl.* § 178 *b.*; Bertholdt, *Einl.* III. 916, and Ewald, *Gesch.* I. 190); *against* which Thenius (p. 15) properly points out that even after this change the high-priesthood remained still in the family of *Aaron*, while the words "and the house of thy father," (vers. 30, 31), clearly shows that the prophecy does not speak of a change *in* the family, and that in vers. 27-36 we have a genuine ancient prediction of a prophet. *Against the view* that the prophecy of the "faithful priest" was, according to 1 Kings ii. 27 fulfilled in the complete transference of the high-priesthood, by the deposition of Abiathar, to the family of Eleazar, to which Zadok belonged, we remark: 1) that (if the advocates of this view mean this family and its succeeding line of high-priests) the words of the prophecy speak of a single person, not of several, or collectively of a body; and 2) that, if Zadok is held to be the "faithful priest" in whom the prophetic word was fulfilled, his person and work have no such epoch-making theocratic significance in the history as we should expect from the prophecy; the expectation is satisfied only in Samuel's priestly-prophetical eminence. For the rest, the words of 1 Kings ii. 27 give no ground for the opinion that the prophecy in ver. 35 is in them referred to *Zadok* (Thenius), since the passage, having in view Abiathar's deposition, is speaking merely of the fulfilment of the threatened punishment of Eli's house, and not at all of the fulfilment of the positive part of the prophecy; there is, therefore, no occasion to speak (with Thenius) of a false conception of this prophecy as early as Solomon's time. The lofty *priestly position*, which Samuel took in his calling as Judge and Prophet before the Lord and His people, the *priestly work*, by which (the regular priesthood completely retiring) he stood as mediator between Jehovah and His people in sacrifice, prayer, intercession and advocacy, and the high *theocratic-reformatory calling*, in which his "important, sacred duty was to walk before the anointed, the king, whom Israel was to receive through him, while the Aaronic priesthood fell for a good time into such contempt, that, in the universal neglect of divine worship, it had to beg honor and support from him, and became dependent on the new order of things begun by Samuel," (O. v. Gerlach),—these things prove that, from the theocratic-historical point of view, in him is fulfilled the prophecy of the faithful priest.

[Four different interpretations explain the "faithful priest" to be Samuel, Zadok, Christ, or a line of priests, including Samuel and Zadok,

and culminating in Christ; the last seems to be the only tenable one. I. We cannot restrict the prophecy to Samuel, for 1) the "established house" promised the faithful priest is clearly a *priestly house*, as is evident from a comparison of ver. 35 with vers. 30, 31, where the everlasting official sacerdotal character of this house is contrasted with the fall of Eli's priestly house; and Samuel founded no such house. 2) Eli's house was not immediately deprived of the high-priesthood, nor was it at all excluded from the priesthood. Up to Solomon's time descendants of Eli were high-priests, and the Jews held that his family continued to exist. Nor did Samuel succeed Eli immediately as Priest and Judge. 3) It is an important fact that Samuel is nowhere called a priest, and it is an exaggeration of his position to ascribe to him a complete sacerdotal character. His *mediatorial* work belonged to him largely as a *man of God*, and similar work was performed by Moses, David, Solomon, none of whom acted as priests. It is doubtful whether Samuel sacrificed at all, still more whether he usually performed this service. The people are said to have sacrificed (1 Sam. xi. 15), where is probably meant that they did it through the priests, and one passage (1 Sam. ix. 13), seems to exclude Samuel from the act of sacrifice. At any rate his performance of sacrificial service may be regarded as extraordinary and unofficial like that of Gideon (Judg. vi. 26, 27) and Solomon (1 Kings iii. 4). But it is true that Samuel's life developed the conception of the theocratically pure and faithful priest in contrast with the self-seeking and immorality of Eli's sons. He was the first protest against their profane perversion of the holy office, the first exemplification after Eli's time of pure-hearted service of God. II. Rashi, Abarbanel and the majority of modern commentators suppose the reference to be to Zadok, Christian writers usually adopting also the Messianic interpretation. And, though 1 Kings ii. 27 mentions only the deposition of Abiathar as the fulfilment of the judgment on Eli's house, yet this, taken with ver. 35, can hardly be dissevered from the installation of Zadok as sole high-priest; the final exclusion of Eli's representative is followed immediately by the elevation of the Zadokite family, which continues in an unbroken line to Christ. That the Zadokites were the true divinely-appointed priests, is assumed throughout the following books of the Old Testament, and especially in such passages as Ezek. xliv. 15, (quoted by Keil). Erdmann's objections to this view do not seem conclusive. He urges: 1) that the prophecy (vers. 27–37) speaks not of a change *within* the Aaronic family, but of a setting aside of that family in favor of a non-Aaronic priest.—But this is not the declaration of the prophecy, (ver. 30 speaks of the exclusion of unworthy members, and the reference is plainly to Eli's immediate family), and is contradicted by the facts of history; for the Aaronic priesthood did continue to the end, while the change announced (ver. 36) was to take place in the history of Israel. Samuel founded no priestly family, and the restriction of the prophecy to him alone is not in keeping with the broadness of its declarations. 2) That Zadok was not specially prominent, and does not exhibit a commanding character cannot be urged against this view, since the prophecy promises not intellectual vigor in the "faithful priest" but theocratic official purity and personal godliness, which Zadok and his descendants in the main exhibited. III. Augustine (De Civ. Dei 17, 5) explains the priest here announced to be Christ alone, basing his view on the breadth and fulness of the statements made about Him. The text does not allow this exclusive reference to Christ, looking plainly, as it does, to the then existing order of things (as in ver. 36, which Augustine interprets of Jewish priests coming to worship Christ), but it may include Him, or rather point to Him as the consummation of the blessedness which it promises; and the remarkable fulness of the terms in ver. 35 naturally leads us to this explanation. IV. If the prophecy finds a partial fulfilment in Samuel and Zadok, and also points to Christ, then it would seem best to regard it as announcing a line of faithful men who would do God's will in full official and personal sympathy with His law. First comes Samuel, not indeed an official priest, but a true representative of the spirituality of the divine service (see 1 Sam. xv. 22). He is followed by Zadok, the father of a long line of priests, who (with many defects) in the main preserve among the people and in the presence of the king the fundamental ideas of the sacrificial service, and are a type (Ez. xliv. 15) of the perfect priesthood into which they are finally merged. To this Erdmann objects that the reference is plainly (ver. 35) to one person, and not to a body of men; but he himself understands the "anointed," in which the expression of singleness is not less distinct, of Saul and David. If the anointed is to be understood of a line of kings, why not the priest of a line of priests?—This last view then seems best to meet the demands of this confessedly difficult passage. See Keil and Wordsworth *in loco*.—Tr.]

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The "man of God" who, by divine commission, predicts the punishment of Eli and his house is a proof that the *prophetic gift*, which appears *sporadically* in the Period of the Judges, had in this its gloomy close not yet disappeared. After it had been said: "there arose not henceforth a prophet in Israel like Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face" (Deut. xxxiv. 10), nevertheless in the time of the Judges, by whose *word* as spoken according to the divine calling and commission, the people had to govern themselves, we see *prophecy* reappearing in the *following individuals:* Judg. ii., the *messenger of the Lord*,* who comes up from Gilgal to Bochim, and exhorts the Israelites to repentance in the name of the Lord; chap. iv., the Judge *Deborah*, who, expressly described as "prophetess," combines the offices of Judge and Prophet, being the organ of Jehovah's communications; chap. vi., the *Prophet* who was sent by the Lord as His *messenger*, to rebuke Israel for their idolatry, and to call Gideon to deliver Israel from the Midianitish bondage. The content of the prophetic declarations, in keeping with the history of the times,

* [It is doubtful whether the *malak* can be considered other than an angel.—Tr.]

is: announcement of divine punishment for the people's idolatry through the oppression of enemies, exhortation to repentance, promise of help.

2. *The internal decline of the theocratic life of God's people* showed itself in the close of the Period of the Judges principally in the corruption of the *sacerdotal* office as cause and effect. In regard, therefore, to the *priestly* mediation between God and the people, there was needed a thorough reformation and a re-establishment of the proper inner relation between them by a true priestly mediation. For this reason the prophetic announcement of the "faithful, true priest" stands at the beginning of the new period, and, at the commencement of the new theocratic development, has an epoch-making fulfilment in Samuel's person and work, in which the priestly side is chiefly prominent.

3. Samuel is in this respect a type of Christ; the idea of the priesthood, as here in ver. 35 expressed, found in all respects its completest and most universal fulfilment in Christ's high-priestly office of mediator between God and man.

4. The conception of the *honor of God* and of *knowing* Him is impossible, without the idea of the personal living God, and without the existence of a relation, established by Him, between Him, the living God, and man, in which the consciousness of absolute *dependence* on Him is connected with that of the *obligation* to be heartily consecrated to Him and in fellowship with Him. The declaration "he who knows Me," *etc.* [ver. 30] expresses God's *righteous* procedure in regard to the recognition or non-recognition of His honor by men.

5. When the guilt of the corruption and decline of the religious-moral life of the people rests on "the house of the Lord," "it is time that judgment should begin at the house of God," 1 Pet. iv. 17.

6. [The walking of the priest before Jehovah's anointed indicates a definite separation between the sacerdotal and judicial or governing offices, and a certain subordination of the first to the second. This was a condition of the developed Israelitish state, and appears in proper form first under David. Saul seems to have exercised authority over the priesthood, but in David's time the relation of political subordination was first united with sincere religious unity of heart and purpose, and thus one step taken towards the perfect and complete form (king, prophet, priest), which was to shadow forth the office and work of Christ.—And, as of Hannah's anticipation of the king, so we may say of the prediction by this man of God of the united king and priest, that it had its root in the felt need of the times, which, as it existed in its distinctest and intensest form in the most spiritual minds of the nation, was guided and elevated and intensified by the Spirit of God into prevision and prophecy.—Tr.].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[Ver. 27. *A man of God.* 1) His office is to come to the people with "Thus saith the Lord." Though inspiration cannot now be expected, he may be "thoroughly furnished" from the Scriptures (2 Tim. iii. 17). 2) When called to give rebukes and warnings, he should do it with faithfulness, solemnity, and tenderness.—Tr.].

Vers. 27–36. *The prophet's sermon of censure,* [German *Strafpredigt*] *against Levi and his house.* 1) Looking back to the past, it recalls the manifold exhibition of the benefits of God's grace, vers. 27, 28; 2) Looking around upon the present, it holds before Eli his sins and those of his house, vers. 29, 30; 3) Looking out upon the future, it proclaims the divine judgment, vers. 30–36.

Vers. 27–30. *To what are we bound by the experience of overflowing manifestations of God's grace?* 1) To be always thankfully mindful of them; 2) To proclaim everywhere the praises of God; 3) By a sober and holy walk to promote the honor of His name.

Vers. 27–36. God's *righteousness* and *grace* in *union* with each other. 1) *Grace* in union with righteousness, vers. 27–32; (*a*) The actual *proofs* and *gifts* of God's grace (vers. 27–29) contain serious *demands* by the holy and righteous God; (*b*) The *promises* of grace are in respect of their fulfilment *conditioned* by the conduct of man towards God, which is weighed by his righteousness, ver. 30; (*c*) In proportion as man in view of the *revelation* of divine grace *gives God the honor or not,* he is *requited* by God according to his righteousness, ver. 30. 2) The severity of God's *righteousness* does not exclude *grace,* vers. 30. (*a*) It suffers itself to lean upon forbearing, softening grace, in order that justice may not execute *complete* destruction, vers. 33, 36; (*b*) It does not take away the *arrangements* which grace has established, but guards and preserves them against the sin of men, vers. 27–29; (*c*) It does not cause the promises of grace to fall away, but makes room for their fulfilment in another way, ver. 35.

Ver. 30. *God the Lord,* according to His righteousness, *remains no man's debtor:* 1) Whoever honors Him, will He also honor; 2) He who despises Him shall be despised in return.—*To honor God the loftiest task* of human life: 1) Wherein it consists; 2) How it is performed; 3) What promise and threatening are here concerned.—[I. Some of the ways in which we may honor God. (1) By speaking His name with reverence. (2) By keeping the Lord's day holy to Him. (3) By propriety of behaviour in public worship. (4) By practically recognizing our dependence on His Providence. (5) By performing all the duties of life as to the Lord (Col. iii. 17). II. Some of the ways in which He will honor us. (1) In causing us to be respected by our fellow-men (Prov. iii. 16). (2) In making us the means of converting others. (3) In receiving us to glory, honor and immortality in heaven (Rom. iii. 7).—Baxter: Never did man dishonor God, but it proved the greatest dishonor to himself. God will find out ways enough to wipe off any stain upon Him; but you will not so easily remove the shame and dishonor from yourselves.—Tr.].

Ver. 35. *The exercise of the priestly office,* which is well-pleasing to God: 1) Its personal *condition* and *pre-supposition,* fidelity, firmness, steadfastness, "I will raise me up a faithful priest;" 2) Its *rule and measure,* "according to that which is in my heart and in my soul;" 3) Its *blessing and reward,* "and I will," *etc.* [Upon the phrase,

"he shall walk before my Anointed forever," comp. above on ii. 10, Hom. and Pract.—Tr.].

Vers. 27–30. The heavy guilt of *neglecting the office of household-priest in the rearing of children:* 1) It wrongs the *welfare and honor of the house*, so far as in earlier times God has in grace and compassion crowned it with blessings, vers. 27–29; 2) In indulgent and weak love to the children it robs *God of the honor* which He demands, ver. 30; 3) It thereby prepares for the children a sure destruction, ver. 34; 4) It often thereby brings a curse and ruin upon succeeding generations, vers. 31–33, 36.

[Hall: Indulgent parents are cruel to themselves and their posterity. Eli could not have devised which way to have plagued himself and his house so much, as by his kindness to his children's sins....... I do not read of any fault Eli had but indulgence; and which of the notorious offenders were plagued more!—Tr.].

SECOND SECTION.

Samuel's Call.

Chapters III.—IV. 1 *a*.

1 And the child Samuel ministered unto the Lord [Jehovah] before Eli. And
the word of the Lord [Jehovah] was precious[1] in those days; there was no open
2 vision [vision spread abroad[2]]. And it came to pass at that time, when [that[3]] Eli
was laid down [lying down[4]] in his place, and his eyes began to wax dim that he
3 could not see. And ere [*om.* ere[5]] the lamp of God went out [was not yet gone out]
in the temple of the Lord, where the ark of God was [*om.* in the temple ....
was[6]] and Samuel was laid down [lying down[4]] to sleep [*om.* to sleep, *ins.* in
4 the temple of Jehovah where the ark of God[7] was], That [And] the Lord [Jeho
5 vah] called [*ins.* to] Samuel, and he answered [said], Here am I. And he ran
unto Eli, and said, Here am I, for thou calledst me. And he said, I called not;
6 [*ins.* go back and] lie down again [*om.* again]. And he went and lay down. And
the Lord [Jehovah] called yet again, Samuel. And Samuel arose and went to Eli,
and said, Here am I, for thou didst call [calledst] me. And he answered [said], I
7 called not, my son, [*ins.* go back and] lie down again [*om.* again]. Now Samuel
did not yet know[8] the Lord [Jehovah], neither was the word of the Lord yet [and
8 the word of Jehovah was not yet] revealed unto him. And the Lord [Jehovah]
called Samuel again the third time. And he arose and went to Eli, and said, Here

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

1 [Ver. 1. — "rare," see Isa. xiii. 12; Chald. renders "hidden."—Tr.]

2 [Ver. 1. This word (נִפְרָץ) is variously rendered: Sept. *διαστέλλουσα*, "distinguishing," "explaining," whence some would (without ground) change the text to פֹּרֵץ (which perhaps the Alex. translator read, the Nun omitted from preceding Nun); Chald. "revealed" — "broken open;" Syr. as Heb.; Arab., "the Lord had deprived the children of Israel of revelation in those days, and there was no revelation to any one of them, and nothing appeared to him;" Vulg. "manifesta;" others, "broken." "diffused," "multiplied;" the Jewish interpreters (Rashi, Kimchi, Ralbag) follow the Targ.: Luther, *wenig weissagung*, "little prophecy;" Erdmann, *verbreitet*, "spread abroad;" Cahen, "*répandu*." This last is probably the correct sense, see 1 Chr. xiii. 2; 2 Chr. xxxi. 5.—Tr.]

3 [Ver. 2. Erdmann renders "when" (as Eng. A. V.) in order to show that the description from this point is introductory to ver. 4; but the literal translation, given above, clearly indicates the connection of thought, and avoids the interpretation of a construction into the text.—Tr.]

4 [Ver. 2 and ver. 4, Or, "was sleeping."—Tr.]

5 [Ver. 3. טֶרֶם with Impf. following the subject — "not yet."—Tr.]

6 [Ver. 3. The Eng. A. V. in making this unwarranted inversion of clauses, was probably controlled by the same motive which led the Masorites to separate שֹׁכֵב ("was lying") from בְּהֵיכַל ("in the temple") by the Athnach, namely, to avoid the seeming assertion that Samuel was sleeping in the sacred building. The Targum accordingly renders "was sleeping in the Court of the Levites," borrowing this term apparently from Herod's temple. For explanation see Exeg. Notes, *in loco*.—Tr.]

7 [Ver. 3. This is the only place where אלהים ("God") in the phrase ארון אלהים ("the ark of God") occurs without the Art.; אלהים often occurs with the force of a proper name, but no reason is apparent why the Art. is omitted here in this standing phrase. For discussion of the difference between אלהים and האלהים see Quarry's "Genesis and its authorship," pp. 270 sqq.—Tr.]

8 [Ver. 7. Erdmann: "had not yet learned to know," which is substantially the same as Eng. A. V. On pointing of ידע see Exeg Notes, *in loco*.—Tr.]

am I, for thou didst[9] call [calledst] me. And Eli perceived that the Lord [Jeho-
9 vah] had called [was calling] the child. Therefore, [And] Eli said unto Samuel,
Go, lie down, and it shall be, if he [one[10]] call thee, that thou shalt say, Speak,
Lord [Jehovah], for thy servant heareth. So [And] Samuel went and lay down
10 in his place. And the Lord [Jehovah] came, and stood,[11] and called as at other
times [as before], Samuel, Samuel. Then [And] Samuel answered [said], Speak,
11 for thy servant heareth. And the Lord [Jehovah] said to Samuel, Behold, I will
[*om.* will] do a thing in Israel, at which both the ears of every one that heareth it
12 shall tingle [the which whosoever heareth, both his ears shall tingle]. In that day
I will perform against Eli all things [*om.* things] which [that] I have spoken con-
cerning his house, when I begin, I will also make an end [from beginning to end].
13 For [And] I have told [I announced to] him that I will [would] judge his house
for ever for the iniquity[12] [sin] which he knoweth, because [that he knew that] his
sons made themselves vile [brought a curse on themselves[13]], and he restrained them
14 not. And therefore I have sworn unto the house of Eli, that the iniquity of Eli's
house shall not be purged [expiated] with sacrifice [*ins.* of blood] nor [*ins.* un-
15 bloody[14]] offering forever. And Samuel lay until the morning,[15] and opened the
doors of the house of the Lord [Jehovah]. And Samuel feared to show Eli the
16 vision. Then [And] Eli called Samuel, and said, Samuel, my son. And he an-
17 swered [said], Here am I. And he said, What is the thing that *the Lord* [*om.* the
Lord, *ins.* he] hath [*om.* hath] said unto thee? I pray thee [*om.* I pray thee[16]]
hide it not from me. God do so to thee and more also, if thou hide anything from
18 me of all the things [*om.* the things] that he said unto thee. And Samuel told him
every whit, and hid nothing from him. And he said, It is the Lord [He is Jeho-
vah]; let him do what seemeth him good.
19 And Samuel grew; And the Lord [Jehovah] was with him, and did let none of
20 his words fall to the ground. And all Israel from Dan even to Beersheba knew
21 that Samuel was established to be a prophet of the Lord [Jehovah]. And the
Lord [Jehovah] appeared again [continued to appear] in Shiloh; for the Lord
[Jehovah] revealed himself to Samuel in Shiloh by [in] the word of the Lord
[Jehovah].[17]

CHAP. IV. 1 *a* AND the word of Samuel came to all Israel.

[9] [Ver. 8. The "didst" might now suggest an emphasis not given by the Heb.—TR.]

[10] [Ver. 9. The impersonal subject is proper, as Samuel did not know who the caller was.—TR.]

[11] [Ver. 10. Chald. softens this anthropomorphism into "revealed himself," and the Rabbis add, by a voice from the Holy of Holies.—TR.]

[12] [Ver. 13. בְּעָוֹן is difficult. It can be understood here only as in stat. const. with the following clause: Eli's sin was "that he knew, *etc.*" So the Vulg. The Targ. and Syr. render as Eng. A. V.; Sept. gives "the iniquities of his sons," and omits "that he knew;" Wellhausen omits בעון.—TR.]

[13] [Ver. 13. להם is here taken as reflexive. The true reading here is not clear; the old translators and critics treated it variously. Sept. has *θεὸν* as if it read אלהים, which Geiger (*Urschrift*, p. 271) and others adopt. See Erdmann's remark on this in Exeg. Notes, *in loco*. Chald. reads as the Heb. (Targ. renders קלל by רגז here and elsewhere); Syr. has "his sons brought ignominy on the people," reading apparently לעם. This is one of the eighteen cases of the "correction of the Scribes" (see Buxtorf's Lex. s. v. תִּקּוּן), who are said to have changed the original reading לִי "me" to להם "themselves," to avoid the blasphemy, for which reason also Geiger holds that אל "God" was changed. Others suggest that the לי stood for ליהוה "Jehovah." But it is hard to say how much reliance is to be put on these alleged corrections of the old Jewish critics, and here (as Wellhausen remarks) we expect the Acc. אוֹתִי not לִי after קלל. The external critical evidence is in favor of the reading אלהים "God," but, the objection to this urged by Erdmann being strong, we can only, with him, retain the present text.—TR.]

[14] [Ver. 14. It seems desirable to express in an Eng. translation the difference between זבח and מנחה.—TR.]

[15] [Ver. 15. Sept. here adds "and rose in the morning," which Thenius and Wellhausen think stood originally in the text, and fell out by similar ending. On the other hand, it is a natural filling out of a terse account, quite in the manner of the Sept.—TR.]

[16] [Ver. 17. The Eng. "I pray thee" is too strong for the Heb. נָא, for which we have no good equivalent.—TR.]

[17] [Ver. 21. On the addition of the Sept. here see Thenius and Wellhausen.—TR.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. *The history of Samuel's call to be prophet is introduced* (ver. 1) by a brief statement of what it presupposed, and what led to it in *Samuel himself* and in the *condition* of the *Israelitish* theocratic life. As to the *first* point, the connection shows that the "*boy*" Samuel had grown to be a *youth*, and was therefore *intellectually* capable of receiving the revelation of the Lord; his character as *servant of the Lord* in the Sanctuary is again stated

(comp. ii. 11, 18), and his *relation* to Eli as his guardian and guide is anew affirmed by the words "*before Eli*" (ii. 11). The call which Samuel receives supposes the fact that he belongs to the Lord as a gift from his parents, and, as servant in the Sanctuary, is, in this priestly life under the guidance of the High-priest, prepared to be a special instrument of God's for His people.—As to the *second* point, the *condition of the theocratical* life, the *religious character* of the times is marked by a twofold expression: 1) the *word of the Lord* was "precious" (יָקָר), that is, the word was *rare* that came directly from the Lord by prophetic announcement to the people; the proper organs were lacking, persons who were filled with the Spirit of the Lord, that they might be witnesses of His word; there was lacking also in the people the living desire for the direct revelations of God in His word, and receptivity in religious feeling for the living declaration,—and this was true even in the highest planes of theocratical life; 2) "*There was no vision spread abroad.*" פָּרַץ "break through," thence "spread out from within," "become known outwards, become public," Ps. iii. 10; 2 Chr. xxxi. 5.—*Hazon* (חָזוֹן) [vision] is the feeling or perception which corresponds to a direct real divine revelation made to the imagination of the prophet.* This "vision" is the means of the reception of the word to be announced. Little was heard of such revelations of the Lord by visions, they were not spread abroad. *Therefore* the word of the Lord was *precious.* The second fact had its ground in the first. In the *theocratical life* there was lacking both a truly God-fearing, living priesthood, and a proclamation of God's word that should extricate the people from their religious-moral depravation, the vitalizing power of the divine Spirit through prophetic organs.

Vers. 2–10. *The circumstances and individual elements of the calling.* In ver. 2 the "and it came to pass" and the statement of time are so connected with ver. 4 that all the intermediate from "and Eli" to the end of ver. 3 is *explanatory parenthesis.*†

Samuel might have supposed, when he was awaked by hearing his name called, that he had to render some service to the half-blind Eli; and so it is expressly mentioned at the beginning of these descriptive sentences that Eli was growing blind. The word "began" shows that the statement afterwards made, "he could not see," is by no means to be understood as meaning complete blindness.‡—To the chronological datum in the beginning of ver. 2 is added in ver. 3 an exacter and more definite statement in the words: **And the lamp of God was not yet gone out**;—no doubt this indicates *night-time, near the morning,* since the seven-lamped candelabrum in the Sanctuary before the curtain, which (Ex. xxvii. 20, 21; xxx. 7, 8) was furnished with oil every morning and evening, after having burnt throughout the night and consumed its oil, usually, no doubt, got feebler or went out towards morning (comp. Lev. xxiv. 2, 3). The words "and S. was sleeping" are not to be regarded, as the Athnach under the last requires, as a parenthesis separated from "in the temple" (as is usually done), if the latter expression is understood to mean sanctuary in distinction from the most holy place; for we cannot suppose that Samuel slept in this Sanctuary. But *hekal* (הֵיכָל) is here, as in ch. i. 9; Ps. xi. 4, the whole sanctuary, the entire space of the tabernacle, as the palace of God, the King of His people, who has His *throne* there. This throne is the "ark of God," for above the ark was the symbol of the presence, yea, of the royal *dwelling and enthronement of God in the midst of His people* (iv. 4). Samuel's sleeping-place was in one of the rooms, which were built in the court for the priests and Levites on service (Keil). The name Jehovah stands after "temple," because it is the Covenant-God, who descends to His people and dwells with them, that is brought before us. On the other hand, in connection with the *lamp* and the *ark* "Elohim" is used "in the sense of the *divine in general,*" (Then.), that is, God is viewed in His loftiness and power over the whole world, as He who is to be feared and venerated, as lofty majesty (which conception is made clear by the plural).

In vers. 2, 3, is described the *situation* in which Samuel received the call of the Lord,—it is night, the High-priest lies in his place in the sanctuary, the lamps of the candelabrum are *still* burning,* the morning is near, it is the time when dream-life rises to its height; near Samuel was the ark of God, whence the revelations of God came.

Vers. 4–10 give the *whole history of the call,* with the attendant circumstances, in its *individual elements.*—Samuel hears the *call of a voice,* which has awakened him from sleep, but takes it to be not the call of a divine voice, as it was, but a call from Eli. Eli, to whom he hastens, sends him back to his couch with the answer: "I did not call thee." This is repeated in ver. 6.—Ver. 7 gives the reason why Samuel thought he heard not *God's* voice, but *Eli's.*† *Knowing* God means here not the general knowledge of God which every Israelite of necessity had, but the

* [*Hazon,* which is used chiefly in the later books of O. T., is 1) the picture presented to the mind in the ecstatic prophetic state; 2) the body of truth thus given to the prophet. It is the technical word for divine revelation (so contrasted with מַרְאֶה).—Tr.]

† [See the remark of Tr. under "Textual and Grammatical."—Tr.]

‡ כהות is *either* verbal adj. כֵּהוֹת, which forms a *single* conception with the preceding fin. verb ("they began dim," *i. e.,* "began to become dim")—as in Gen. ix. 20 the same verb is connected with a subst., Ges., § 142, 4, Rem.—*or* Inf. Qal כְּהוֹת (comp., Isa. iii. 7; Gen. xxvii. 1; Deut. xxxiv. 7; Job xvi. 8; Zech. xi. 17), "which the punctuators avoided only because they had not elsewhere met with it" (Böttch.). [This whole note, quoted by Erdmann and Thenius from Böttcher, is somewhat unclear. The passages cited for the Inf. hardly bear on the question. Wellhausen declares the Inf. here without לְ impossible; but see Deut. ii. 25, 31. Winer makes it Piel. Inf.—Tr.]

* [The Sept. has "before the lamp was prepared," which may point to the custom of keeping one light burning during the day, and thus indicate the late night or early morning.—Tr.]

† טֶרֶם is seldom used, as here, with the *Perf.* of past time; comp. Ps. xc. 2; Ew. § 337, 3, *c.* We might however point also יֵדַע with Böttcher, and thus read, "in accordance with the following יִגָּלֶה, a Fiens [Impf.] with טֶרֶם, as is usual."

special knowledge of God, which was given by extraordinary revelation of God. The experience which now comes to Samuel is marked as the *first* of the sort. **The word of God had not yet been revealed to him.** He had not yet received such a special revelation of God through His word; *therefore* he did not yet know the God who revealed Himself *in this way*.—"It was a gloomy time, poor in revelation, as in exemplary religious life. For Eli, the High-priest, was weak, his sons defiled the sanctuary, the people served idols (vii. 3 sq.), and the Philistines ruled oppressively. Hence it came that Samuel did not yet know how the Lord was used to reveal Himself to the prophets, the announcer of His word to men (iii. 1, 7)" (Nägelsbach, Herz. *R.-E.* XIII. 395 sq.). After the third repetition of the call (ver. 8), Eli observed the *divine origin* of the call, and showed Samuel (ver. 9) how he should deport himself towards the divine voice. His answer was to be: "Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth."—Up to this point the medium of the divine revelation was the thrice repeated call of a voice, which so strongly impressed Samuel's *hearing*, that he was awakened out of sleep. This is the meaning of the narrative; it does not mean a voice, which he thought he heard in a dream merely. In ver. 10 a new factor is introduced: the divine revelation by means of a voice becomes a *vision:* **Jehovah came and stood,** that is, before Samuel. That an objective real appearance is here meant is clear from ver. 15, "the vision" (מַרְאָה). Three factors are to be combined: the *dream-state* of Samuel's soul (the internal sense), the *hearing* a voice on awakening, the *seeing* an appearance.

Vers. 11–14. Here follows the *divine announcement* of the judgment on Israel and the house of Eli. The Pres. (עֹשֶׂה partcp.) brings the act, though still in the future, before us as near, immediately and surely impending.* The *tingling of both ears* is the mark of dread and horror, which comes suddenly on a man, so that he well nigh loses his senses. Clericus' reference to the Lat. *attonitus* is excellent, comp. Jer. xix. 3. The unheard of horror which was to make both ears tingle was (chap. iv.) the frightful defeat of Israel in battle with the Philistines, and the loss of the ark to this heathen people.—As in ver. 11 the horror, which is to come *upon Israel*, is announced, so in vers. 12–14 is declared the judgment *of the house of Eli*. In ver. 12 the Infs. Abs. (הָחֵל וְכַלֵּה) serve to explain and define the verb fin., "beginning and ending," that is, from beginning to end, fully, entirely. *Not one word* of the minatory prophecy (ii. 27 sq.) is to remain *unfulfilled*. (See Ew. § 280, 3 *a*).—In ver. 13 this announcement is recapitulated. The *declaration* was a threat, no longer a warning. *Judging* is in sense (comp. Gen. xv. 14) identical with *punishing*. This punishment will be inflicted on Eli's *house* "for ever;" the judgment will never again be removed from it. In what did Eli's sin consist? In the neglect of the duty which he ought to have performed to his sons as father, high-priest and judge, by the employment of severe chastisement and punishment. He knew their crimes, but let them go unpunished. מְקַלְלִים לָהֶם "cursed themselves" is very hard to explain, unless with Sept. and Then., we read אֱלֹהִים for לָהֶם, and translate "they brought God into contempt," the Pi. being taken as causative, and Qal="to come into contempt." Certainly this rendering would agree with chap. ii. 17; but—aside from the untrustworthiness of the Sept. in relation to the Heb. text, which also may here have been arbitrarily treated on account of this difficulty—against this reading is the fact that God Himself here speaks. The conjecture adduced by Grotius, לִי ("the Hebrews wrote that for לָהֶם 'themselves' formerly stood לִי 'me,'") must be rejected on account of the difference in the letters. There remains no other course than to translate "cursing, bringing a curse on, themselves," according to the usual explanation.* Luther gives the correct sense: "that his sons behaved shamefully." [So Eng. A. V. "made themselves vile," but this is not exactly correct. See translation and textual note.—Tr.]—Ver. 14. The announcement that the punishment is imposed for ever (ver. 13) is here marked by the divine oath as irrevocable. (אִם, in view of the *ellipsis*, with *negative* force, Ges. § 155, 2 sq.). The *transgression of Eli's house* is here spoken of because not only did Eli's sins of omission and his sons' sins of commission prove them personally worthy of punishment before God, but the religious depravation that issued from them affected the whole family, even their posterity. (יִתְכַּפֵּר Pass. for the usual כִּפֶּר). Because the *guilt* can *never* be *expiated*, therefore the *sentence* will never be recalled, but, agreeably to the Lord's true word, will be carried out on Eli's house. The double "for ever" at the end of the two declarations (vers. 13, 14) expresses the terrible earnestness of the divine justice. [As to the relation between this announcement (iii. 11–14) and the other (ii. 27–26), the latter is founded on and supposes the earlier, but does not exactly repeat it. The first message seems (strangely enough) not to have produced the desired effect, namely to rouse Eli and save his house; for, though it is expressed absolutely, we have to suppose that the doom might be averted by repentance and obedience, as in the case of Nineveh. But the old man was too weak, and his sons (who must have heard of the prophet's threatened punishment) too far gone in sin. No moral change occurs to remove the implied moral condition of the doom, and the sentence is to be executed. Still God will not leave His old servant without another appeal; He sends another message by Samuel. The first prophecy (chap. ii.) reviewed the history of the sacerdotal house of Eli, exposed its unfaithfulness, announced its deposition, and looked beyond to the glory of a new and faithful priestly house. The second prophecy, given through Samuel, reaffirms the punishment, em-

* On the intrans. תְּצִלֶּינָה see Ew. § 196 *d* [comp. Green's Heb. *Gr.* § 141, 2.—Tr.].

* כִּהָה Pi. here trans. "to make faint, weak, frighten" by threatening, terrifying conduct, as elsewhere גָּעַר with בְּ, *increpare aliquem*.

phasizes Eli's personal guilt, and declares the sentence on the priestly house to be irrevocable. Its object, then, would seem to be two-fold: 1) to rouse Eli and his sons to repentance and quickening into spiritual life, (see Eli's response in verse 18, whereas no answer of his to the first threat is recorded); 2) to accredit Samuel as a prophet by making him the bearer of a message that the whole nation would hear of, and to develop his spiritual-prophetic earnestness and faithfulness by bringing him into personal contact with the most serious events. It is hardly to be supposed that the conduct of Eli and his sons had been unobserved by Samuel. Rather they must have occasioned him (in connection with the man of God's announcement) much serious thought, so that his message to Eli was not something apart from his own intellectual and spiritual life. We must notice, also, the difference in breadth and maturity between the declaration committed to the (doubtless) full-grown man of God, and that delivered through the youth Samuel.—Tr.].

Vers. 15-18. *Samuel before Eli as called prophet of the Lord in his first prophetic function.* Although Eli had already received from the "man of God" (ii. 27) the prediction of punishment, yet his conduct gives occasion to the repetition (through Samuel who had a direct call from the Lord) of the prophetic announcement of judgment on his house as a word of immediate revelation from the Lord.—Vers. 15 sq. describe with such psychological and historical minuteness, such clearness and truth to life Samuel's external situation and tone of mind after the revelation and appearance, and the conduct of Eli who was roused to earnest interest* by the thrice-occurring call to Samuel, that neither here nor in the preceding description (vers. 1-14) is there any ground for Ewald's opinion that this is not an original tradition. After this revelation Samuel sleeps in his bed till morning. Opening "the *doors of God's house*" was a part of his duty in the sanctuary. By the *doors* we are not to understand the curtains, but real doors, which belonged, however, not to the cells which were perhaps built around, but "to the house of God" itself. Originally, indeed, the Tabernacle, being a tent, had no doors, but, after it was fixed in Shiloh with a *solid* enclosure, it might somehow have been provided with them. "Perhaps it stood within a larger frame, or a solid temple-space of stone built for its protection" (Leyrer in Herzog's *R.-E.* XV. 116.)—Samuel is afraid to tell Eli the *vision*, the *appearance* (מַרְאָה) which had presented itself to his internal sense, in which God's revelation concerning the house of Eli had been set forth before him—partly from awe at the divine word which formed the content of the revelation, partly on account of the dreadful significance it had for Eli, partly by reason of the sorrow of which, in his reverence and filial piety towards Eli, he could not rid himself. But Eli compels him to tell what he had so wondrously learned.—On "my son," ver. 16, Thenius admirably remarks: "How much is expressed by this *one* word!" In ver. 17 observe the *climax* in the words with which, *in three sentences*, Eli demands information from Samuel; it expresses the excitement of Eli's soul. He *asks* for the word of the Lord; he *demands* an exact and complete statement; he *adjures* Samuel to conceal nothing from him. **God do so to thee and more also**, if, *etc.*, is a frequent form of adjuration,* which threatens punishment from God, if the request is not complied with, comp. xiv. 44; xx. 18.—Ver. 18. **And Samuel told him every whit.** His fear was overpowered by Eli's demand. In obeying Eli he was at the same time obeying the Lord, whose command to enter on his prophetic calling before Eli he must have recognized in the latter's demand. **And he** (Eli) **said.** *Two things* Eli says: **It is the Lord!** This is the utterance of *submission* to the Lord. He sees confirmed what the man of God announced to him, and recognizes the indubitable revelation of the Lord. **Let Him do what seemeth Him good.** This is the expression of *resignation* to the unchangeable will of the Lord. To the overwhelming declaration of God Eli shows a complete resignation, giving himself and his house into God's hands, without trying to excuse or justify himself, but also, it is true, without exhibiting thorough penitence.

Vers. 19-21. *The result of Samuel's call to the prophetic office*, and, at the same time, *transition* to the description of his *prophetical work* in Israel. 1) In ver. 19 *a* the *divine principle in his development* into a man of God in his prophetic office is expressly emphasized, his growth from youth to manhood (וַיִּגְדַּל) being set forth under the highest theocratic point of view, which is marked by the words: **And the Lord was with him.**—To him were imparted God's revelations for Israel, because he was a man after God's heart, who, amid the temptations to evil that surrounded him in Shiloh, was now as a *youth* mature and tried in true fear of God and sincere fellowship with God; and his growth rested on a *childhood* consecrated to the Lord. "The Lord was with him." This refers not merely to the general proofs of God's goodness and mercy, to the blessing which he received from the Lord throughout his life, but also to the special revelations and gifts of the Spirit which the Lord imparted to him as His chosen instrument. For 2) in ver. 19 *b* in the words **And he let none of his words fall to the ground** is emphasized the *divine demonstration of Samuel's prophetic character* by God's fulfilment of what he prophetically announced as the word revealed to him. The expression "did not let fall" indicates that the word was not spoken in vain, but was fulfilled,† comp. Josh. xxi. 45; xxiii. 14; 1 Kings viii. 56; 2 Kings x. 10. 3) Ver. 20 exhibits his *general recognition* in Israel as a tried instrument for the Lord in the prophetic office. The geographical indication of the extent of this recognition supposes that Samuel was made known

* [The words "Eli who was roused to earnest interest" have been supplied by the translator, something amounting to this having fallen out of the text, probably by typographical error.—Tr.]

* [This means not, "may God do to you as you do to me," but "may God visit your refusal with appropriate punishment."—Tr.]

† [The origin of the figure has been sought for in various occurrences, as the spilling of water, the fall of an arrow, or any weapon of war, or of a house, but it is better understood in a general way as signifying "failures," in contrast with a firm, upright position.—Tr.]

to the whole people from *Dan* on the north to *Beersheba* on the south (Judg. xx. 1) as a prophet of the Lord by his declaration of the word of God. (נֶאֱמָן, "found trustworthy," "tried," Num. xii. 7). From this it is evident that the people of Israel, in spite of their disruption, yet formed religiously a unit. In spite of the general lack of the declaration of God's word, there was still altogether a receptivity for it; notwithstanding the decline of the religious-moral life there was not lacking a sense for the self-revelation of the living God through His chosen instrument, *the prophet Samuel*. It is no doubt intimated in ver. 20 "that Samuel, in contrast with the hitherto isolated appearances of prophets, was known as a man called to a permanent prophetic work" (Nägelsbach, Herz. *R.-E.* XIII. 26). For the factual ground of ver. 20 is given in the closely connected v. 21, where 4) are stated *the continued direct revelations of God to Samuel in Shiloh*. "*Jehovah continued to appear in Shiloh.*" This points to *visions* as the form of revelation for the internal sense, and as the continuation of the mode of appearance which is set forth in vers. 10, 15 as "vision." The words "for the Lord *revealed* Himself to Samuel in Shiloh *by the word* of the Lord" leave no doubt that that revelation in *visions* also was made to Samuel, and that the *word* was the heart and the guiding star of these revelations of the Lord made to him that they might be imparted to the people. As the people had hitherto had its centre in Shiloh in the Tabernacle with the ark as the symbol of God's indwelling and presence, so now it found in *the same place* a new centre in the continued revelations of the Lord to Samuel through His *word*. From now on God made known His will to the people by the revelation of His word to Samuel, the first representative of the permanent prophetic order.* Thus, then, the beginning of the fourth chapter: **And the word of Samuel came to all Israel**—is closely connected with the preceding. The *word of Samuel* is in content "the word of *the Lord*," which was directly revealed to him, he being from now on favored with this revelation (ver. 21) in the form of the *vision* (מַרְאָה); thus the declaration "God revealed Himself to Samuel" is by no means superfluous (Then.); for it is not "the revelation mentioned above" which is here meant, but that which was constantly repeated in *vision*, by virtue of which Samuel was the *Roeh* (רֹאֶה), seer. In *form* the word of Samuel was *prophetic announcement*, as organ of which he was *Nabi* (נָבִיא), God's spokesman, interpreter.† His word came "*to all Israel*." In these words is comprised 5) *his prophetic work in all Israel*, and the permanent effect of his call to the prophetic office (made by the first revelation) is indicated. The word which came to him from God went by him to the whole people. This close connection of these words with the preceding context, and their closing and comprehensive character shows plainly how incorrect is the ordinary view which connects them with the following, and regards them as a call by Samuel to battle with the Philistines. They are the summary description of his *prophetic* work, on which his *judicial* labors rested, the transition to these latter being made in the following narration of Israel's public national calamity.

* [It is an old opinion that there is here a reference to the personal Word, the second Person of the Trinity. The Targ. has "the word of Jehovah was his help," and so some modern commentators, as Gill. But plainly there is no ground for this.—Tr.]

† [On *Roeh* and *Nabi* see on chap. ix. 9.—Tr.]

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. Samuel's *person* and *labors* as *prophet*. "So the Lord's training had borne its fruits. Samuel had been preserved amid the temptations of Shiloh. He had grown up to be a consecrated man and faithful prophet of the Lord—a man of God in the midst of an apostate race—a light in the darkness, and much was gained when God's word was once more to be found in the land." (Schlier, *Die Könige in Isr.*, 1865, 2 ed., p. 5.)

"The vigorous and connected ministry of the prophets begins with *Samuel*, who is therefore to be regarded as the true founder of the Old Testament prophetic order (comp. Acts iii. 24). It was that extraordinary time when, with the removal of the ark, the Tabernacle had lost its significance as centre, the high-priest's functions were suspended, and now the mediatorship between God and the people rested altogether in the inspired prophet. While the limits of the old ordinances of worship are broken through, Israel learns that Jehovah has not restricted His saving presence to the ancient symbol of His indwelling among the people, rather is to be found everywhere, where He is earnestly sought, as God of salvation." Oehler in Herz. *R.-E. s. v. Prophetenthum des A. T.* XII. 214.

2. The *time* of Samuel's appearance in Israel as prophet was *the time of an internal judgment of God*, which consisted in the *preciousness of God's word*, that is, in the lack of *intercourse of God with His people by revelation*. It was a *theocratic interdict** incurred by the continued apostasy of the people from their God, and inflicted by God's justice. It had the disciplinary aim to lead their hearts back to the Lord, who had long kept silence, had long suspended His revelations. Such a judgment of the cessation of all revelation-intercourse of God with man came upon Saul, xxviii. 6, 15; comp. the complaint in Ps. lxxiv. 9, "there is no longer any prophet," and the wail in Am. viii. 11 sq. over the famine of God's word. The same law presents itself in all periods of the kingdom of God; men lose the source of life, God's revealed word, by a divine judgment, when they withdraw from intercourse with the living God, and will not accept His holy word as the truth which controls their whole life.

3. *The form of God's revelation* in prophecy is, as we see in Samuel, internal sight, the *vision*, to which the original appellation *Roeh* (רֹאֶה or חֹזֶה) † (according to 1 Sam. ix. 9, the earlier usual designation of the prophet) points. "*Vision* and *word of God* are in iii. 1 parallel expressions for prophecy." "The vision is nothing but the inner incorporation, and therefore also symbolization of what is felt in the mind—whether it be in visible

* [The Papal Interdict forbids the celebration of divine service, the administration of the sacraments, ecclesiastical burial and marriage (by Romish ministers), and enjoins fasting and prayer.—Tr.]

† [On the relation between רֹאֶה and חֹזֶה see below, chap. ix. 9.—Tr.]

shape for the inner eye, or vocally for the inner ear." (Tholuck, *Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen*, 1861, p. 54.) The *internal sight*, by means of which the prophet knows that the content of the prophecy, the matter of the announcement to be made, has been imparted to him by God directly, altogether independently of his own activity, is the *vision in the wider sense.* For this reason Samuel, like all other prophets, is called a *Seer.* After his soul, detached from the outer world of sense through the medium of the dream, has thus been brought into a state of more concentrated receptivity for the revelation of God, he *sees* with the internal sense the matter of the prophetic declaration directly imparted to him by God. "But when the revelation presents its content in visible shape before the prophet's soul, there results the *vision in the stricter sense.*" (Oehler, Herz. *R.-E.* XVII. 637.)

4. In the history of Samuel's call to the prophetic office are united prototypically *all essential momenta* of theocratic prophecy:* 1) *the ethical condition* of the absolute *consecration of the person and the whole life to God's service* on the basis of sincere life-communion with Him, and of mutual intercourse between God and the prophet—("Speak, Lord, thy servant *heareth;*" comp. Jer. xxxiii. 2 sq.: "*call unto me*, and I will answer thee, and show thee great and mighty things, which thou knowest not"); 2) the definite, direct, clearly recognized and irresistible *call of God* to be the instrument of His revelation, the declarer of His word which is to be imparted to him, connected with the gift of inspiration and *capacity therefor by the controlling power of the Spirit of God;* 3) the *reception of God's special revelation by word* independently of human teaching and instruction and his own investigation and meditation, together with the consciousness of having been favored with a disclosure of God's objective thoughts; 4) the *internal sight* as the subjective medium of the reception of the revelation of God, the psychical form of prophecy; 5) the *declaration* of the revelation received, with the *certainty* and *confidence* (produced by the Spirit) that the announced *word* will be confirmed by the corresponding divine *deed.* Comp. Oehler, *Weissagung*, Herz. *R.-E.* XVII. 627 sqq.†

5. *The triple repetition of the divine call* to Samuel betokens God's holy arrangement for preparing His inner life, that he might become an exclusive organ of divine revelation (comp. vers. 7, 8), freed from human authority, his soul open only to the utterances of the living God, as is shown by Samuel's answer to the divine voice: "Speak, Lord, thy servant heareth" (vers. 9, 10); for by this answer Samuel assumes the position of one who has direct converse with the Lord, that he may, as his servant, hear what the Lord will say to him by His revelations, and thereby the end of the threefold preparative call is fulfilled.

6. That the light of the divine word may illuminate the inner life, the latter must be open to this light, as it is given by divine revelation. The humble *readiness* to hear and accept God's counsels with the *ear of faith* is called forth by the *awakening call* of God's voice, and leads to the clear knowledge of His word. The *way* to fellowship with the living God and service in His kingdom is opened and prepared only by God's act of grace in *calling* men by the voice of His word; and so *living* and *abiding* continually in fellowship with the Lord is conditioned on the word of revelation, in which the Lord speaks to the soul that stands fast in the obedience of faith. Thus the individual elements of this history of Samuel's call present a picture of the grace of God that calls us, as all they *learn* or *experience*, who, like Samuel, occupy such a position towards God's word, that to God's call they answer with him: "Speak, Lord, thy servant heareth."

7. *Pardoning grace** (ver. 14) is open to every sinner, and is denied by God for no sin, if there be, on the man's part, honest, hearty repentance for sin as enmity against God and violation of His holy will, and confident trust in His grace and mercy, that is, if there be a thorough conversion to the Lord. In Eli's house, in spite of the preceding divine warnings and threatenings, there was continued, persistent sin, and Eli did not summon the resolution to make an energetic cleansing of his house and thoroughly to remove his sons' wickedness, which he ought to have felt especially bound to do as high-priest; such sin makes it impossible that God's grace should be shown in the forgiveness of sin, puts a limit to God's patience and long-suffering, and draws down on itself His punitive judgments as necessary proofs of His holiness and justice. [The Mosaic Law had no offering for presumptuous sins; but underneath the Law (which was civil-political in its outward form) lay the fundamental principle of the forgiveness of the penitent sinner, developed, for example, in Ps. li. and others. This principle, however, though doubtless part of the spiritual thought of ancient Israel, did not find full expression till it was announced that the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin. But in the New Testament, as in the Old Testament, there is no pardon without repentance.—Tr.]

8. The true permanent *unity of Israel, dismembered, as the nation was, during the Period of the Judges*, was established by Samuel by means of the word of God which, in his prophetic proclamation, embraced all Israel. Even in times when the national, political and religious-ecclesiastical life is most sadly shattered and disrupted, the divine word, if it is only preached lovingly by preachers that live in it, shows its purifying and unifying power, the receptivity for it being present, and only needing to be called forth.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1. Cramer: That is the greatest and most perilous scarcity, when God causes a dearth, not of bread but of His word.—Wuert. Bible: God does not give His holy word to every one and at every time in great abundance, but causes at certain times also a scarcity therein to be suffered, Ezek. iii. 26; Amos viii. 11, 12.

[Vers. 3–14. Stanley: The stillness of the night—the sudden voice—the childlike misconception—the venerable Eli—the contrast between

* [*Momentum*, translation of Germ. "moment," "essential or important element."—Tr.]

† [See also Fairbairn on Prophecy, Chap. I., and Lee on Inspiration.—Tr.]

* [In the Germ. *versöhnungs-gnade*—"grace of expiation."—Tr.]

the terrible doom and the gentle creature who has to announce it—give to this portion of the narrative a universal interest. It is this side of Samuel's career that has been so well caught in the well-known pictures by Sir Joshua Reynolds.—Tr.]

Vers. 3-10. Steinmeyer (Testimonies to the glory of Christ, Berlin, 1847): *The call of Samuel the Prophet, as an image of our entering into communion with the Lord;* 1) How the *occasion* for this communion is given *on the part of God*, 2) How the *condition* of it is fulfilled *on the part of Samuel*, and 3) How this communion itself was begun.—*Awaking from sleep!* What a striking designation of the turning point between the old and the new in our life also. We were like them that sleep, them that dream, before we entered into communion with God. It is, however, certainly no arbitrary pre-supposition, that this pure, simple, upright nature had definite presentiments that he must be in what was his God's, and that he was moved by a longing, even though not understood, after the hour which now struck; and even this position of heart appears to find in the image of sleep its beautiful, exactly-corresponding expression. More or less, however, the comparison will also be applicable to us all. If the grace of the Lord caused us to grow up in the temple of His church, as Samuel in the sanctuary at Shiloh, if we were, like him, from childhood nourished with the sincere milk of the word, then there will always in our awaking be a definite recollection that already long before we found ourselves unawares in this sphere, only that hitherto our eyes were holden, while now we are allowed to look freely and without hindrance into the riches of His grace and His truth.

[How far this sort of analogical preaching may be carried, is a question of opinion. There are many who will think it has been carried quite too far in this paragraph.—Tr.]

Vers. 8-9. The fact that Samuel, notwithstanding the old man's assurance that he had not called him, appeared again, and came the third time, without consulting with flesh and blood, was a proof of his simplicity and uprightness. This is indeed the same uprightness which the Redeemer commends in Nathaniel, and here we have certainly a striking example of the Scripture saying: The Lord makes the upright prosper.—That the youth was ready without fretting to present himself three times for the service of his fatherly teacher—what else is it than his obedience towards him to whose discipline and service he had now devoted himself, so firmly grounded in obedience that he did not allow himself to be turned away from his simple, quiet path, not even by the most wonderful testimonies, by perfectly incomprehensible directions. And so with us too, if in any relation whatever we have only learned true obedience, if the position and state of our heart has become that of full and humble subjection, then we are no longer far from the Kingdom of God, which demands blind, unshakable obedience, within which one cannot maintain himself without giving himself up unconditionally to the one authority of Christ in faith as well as in life, and which utterly excludes all selfishness, in whatever form it may come up, all self-will, all entering upon a self-chosen path. [The analogy here and in what follows is extremely remote, and such a use of the passage would seem injudicious.—Tr.] —If we too have only first reached in general the point of being able to believe without seeing—for faith too must be learned—able to believe in the first place the human teaching, rebuking, consoling word,—well, then we are on the way, since the voice of the divine word is believingly received by us.

[Henry: There was a special Providence in it, that Samuel should go thus often to Eli; for hereby, at length, Eli perceived that the Lord had called the child, ver. 8. (1) This would be a mortification to him, and he would apprehend it to be a step toward his family's being degraded, that when God had something to say he should choose to say it to the child Samuel, his servant that waited on him, and not to him. (2) This would put him upon inquiring what it was that God said to Samuel, and would abundantly satisfy him of the truth and certainty of what should be delivered, and no room would be left for him to suggest that it was but a fancy of Samuel's.—Tr.]

Ver. 10. So then for the first time Samuel stands with consciousness in the presence of the majesty of God—and immediately all the riddles of life begin to be solved for him, and the meaning of *his own life* to become clear. What he says bears the clearest stamp of *a really begun communion with the Lord.* Is it not the resolve to say and to do all that the Lord might show him of his lofty thoughts and ways—is it not this, and nothing but this, that is expressed in Samuel's words: Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth? Has he not thereby once for all renounced self-knowing and self-will? That was the *faithfulness* as a prophet, which all Israel from Dan even to Beersheba recognized in him (ver. 20). And that which thus first established a true communion with the Lord could also alone be the power that maintained it. The constant prayer, "Speak, Lord," and the constant vow, "Thy servant heareth,"—that is the hand which takes hold of God's right hand, to be held fast by it with everlasting life.

Ver. 10. "*Speak, Lord, thy servant heareth," a testimony of unconditional devotion to the Lord:* 1) How such a testimony is reached, (*a*) through the Lord's awakening call, (*b*) through receptivity of heart for God's word, and (*c*) through the deed of self-denial in the renunciation of all self-knowing and self-will; 2) What is therein testified and praised before the Lord: (*a*) humble subjection (Speak, *Lord*), (*b*) steadfast dependence on the Lord in free love (*thy* servant), (*c*) unconditional, joyful obedience to His will (thy servant *heareth*.) —*Conditions of a blessed fulfillment of one's calling for the Kingdom of God:* 1) The experience of the power of the divine word: I have called thee by *thy name;* 2) The repeated call in prayer, "*Speak, Lord!*" and 3) The fulfillment of the vow: "*thy servant heareth.*"

Ver. 11. Lange: It is God's design that when He causes great judgments to occur, men shall with holy terror accept them as a warning. God begins in good time to bring into holy fear the hearts of those whom he wishes to make special and great instruments of advancing His honor. Ver. 12. Starke: The Lord's word is true; Psa. xxxiii. 4 [in German; Eng. Ver. correctly:

right.—Tr.] Let men therefore not mock at God's word and threatenings.—Calvin: The guilt becomes so much the greater, when God warns sinners of their transgressions, and they notwithstanding persevere in them. Ver. 13. Eli's guilt becomes so much the greater from the fact that it was known to him how shamefully his sons behaved, and he *did* nothing to remove this abomination from his house and from the sanctuary. Calvin: Those who are set for the purpose of chastising the wicked make themselves partakers of a like guilt with them, and go quite over to their side, when at most they express censure with *words*, and so give themselves the appearance of strictness and earnestness, but do not use the power conferred on them to interfere with the godlessness by *deeds*.—Ver. 14. If the sons of Eli had earnestly repented, they would have obtained grace. But as they were given up to their godless disposition, they must of necessity be hardened in their sins, and in spite of the offerings they presented, which were an abomination in the sight of the Lord, must suffer judgment.

[Vers. 11–14. Compare this warning with that previously sent to Eli (ii. 27–36). 1) It is *simpler*, as was appropriate when given through a youth. 2) It is mainly a *repetition* of what he had been told before, as are so many of God's messages to men;—the sin mentioned is 'the iniquity which he knoweth' (ver. 13), and the punishment is 'all that I have spoken' (ver. 12). 3) It contains a still *more severe* threatening, as the former had not led to repentance; (*a*) an unknown horror is predicted, (*b*) a punishment of his family that shall never cease. 4) It arouses Eli to enough of spiritual life for *submission* (ver. 18), but not enough for *amendment*. (Comp. addition by Tr. to Exegetical on ver. 14).—Tr.]

Ver. 18. We should never venture to dispute with God nor wish to speak against and oppose His purpose, but must, even when we do not recognize the ground of His judgments, yea, when we think we are suffering unjustly, adore the righteousness and holiness of His judgments. Eli bowed himself, it is true, in humility and reverence before the Divine Majesty, but we do not see that he stirred himself up to fulfil his duty towards his godless sons, whereby he would have made known by action the earnestness of his own conversion from the slackness and yielding compliance, which made him the sharer of his sons' guilt. We should therefore lay it earnestly to heart, not merely with the mouth to give God the honor for His wisdom and righteousness, but upon His call to repentance to subject our own life to an earnest self-examination, in order that then we may beseech God to forgive our sins, and may with our whole heart avoid and flee from evil.—Ver. 19. The word of God does not return void, whether it promises or threatens, and preachers of the word of God learn with Samuel that none of their words fall to the ground, and this just in proportion as they are diligent to preach nothing else than God's word.

[Vers. 15–18. *Evil Tidings.* 1) Samuel shrinks from telling them, as a painful duty. 2) Eli is anxious to be told. (*a*) He apprehends ill news for himself—accusing conscience—reminded of the warning given through the prophet (ii. 27 sqq.) (*b*) But he desires to know the worst—earnestly conjures Samuel to tell him all. 3) Eli hears evil tidings with submission. (*a*) 'He is Jehovah'—the sovereign God—the covenant God—'too wise to err, too good to be unkind.' (*b*) 'Let him do,' *etc.* He submits humbly, trustfully, lovingly. Hall: If Eli have been an ill father to his sons, yet he is a good son to God, and is ready to kiss the very rod he shall smart withal.)—Tr.]

Ver. 20. *Samuel a true prophet of the Lord;* 1) Whereby he was such. 2) How he proved himself such before the whole people. 3) How he was recognized as such by them. 4) How he is an example for the faithful in the ministry of God's word.

Cramer: Not only of the whole church in general, but of every Christian hearer in particular is it demanded, that with reference to the doctrine taught he shall perceive whether it is right and true or not, and stand his ground. In the case of Samuel the word did not hold good: The prophet has no honor in his own country. He comes before us here as *a prophet who has much honor in his own country*, 1) Because he was a faithful prophet of God, 2) Because he was counted worthy by God of continual revelations through his word, and 3) God confirmed his proclamations by the publicly manifested fulfillment of them as a fulfillment of *his* word.

[Vers. 19–21. Henry: *The honor done Samuel as a prophet:* 1) God did him honor (*a*) By further manifestations of Himself to him. (*b*) By fulfilling what He spake by him. 2) Israel did him honor. (*a*) He grew famous. (*b*) He grew useful and very serviceable to his generation. He that began betimes to *be* good, soon came to *do* good.—Tr.]

SECOND DIVISION.

SAMUEL'S WORK AS PROPHET, PRIEST AND JUDGE.

1 Sam. Chapter IV. 1 *b*—Chapter VII.

FIRST SECTION.

Infliction of the Punishment prophesied by Samuel on the House of Eli and on all Israel in the unfortunate Battle with the Philistines.

Chap. IV. 1 *b*—VII. 1.

I. *Israel's double defeat and loss of the Ark.* IV. 1 *b*—11.

1 Now[1] [And] Israel went out against the Philistines to battle, and pitched beside
2 Ebenezer[2]; and the Philistines pitched in Aphek. And the Philistines put them-
selves in array against Israel, and when [*om.* when] they joined battle[3], [*ins.* and]
Israel was smitten before the Philistines, and they slew of the army in the field
3 about four thousand men. And when the people were come [And the people came]
into the camp, [*ins.* and] the elders of Israel said, Wherefore hath the Lord [Je-
hovah] smitten us to-day before the Philistines? Let us [We will] fetch the ark
of the covenant[4] of the Lord [Jehovah] [*ins.* to us] out of [from] Shiloh unto us
[*om.* unto us], that, when it cometh [and it shall come] among us [into our midst]
4 it may [*om.* it may, *ins.* and] save us out of the hand of our enemies. So [And]
the people sent to Shiloh that they might bring [and brought] from [*om.* from]
thence the ark of the covenant of the Lord [Jehovah] of hosts, which dwelleth
between the cherubims [who sitteth upon the cherubim[5]]; and the two sons of Eli,
Hophni and Phinehas, were there[6] with the ark of the covenant of God.
5 And [*ins.* it came to pass],when the ark of the covenant of the Lord [Jehovah]
came into the camp, all Israel shouted with a great shout, so that the earth rang
6 again[7]. And when [*om.* when] the Philistines heard the noise of the shout [*ins.*
and] they said, What meaneth the noise of this great shout in the camp of the He-
brews? And they understood that the ark of the Lord [Jehovah] was come into
7 the camp. And the Philistines were afraid, for they said, God[8] is come into the
camp. And they said, Woe unto us! for there hath not been such a thing hereto-
8 fore. Woe unto us! who shall deliver us out of the hand of these mighty gods?
these are the gods that smote the Egyptians with all the plagues [every sort of

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. The LXX here insert: "and it came to pass in those days that the Philistines gathered themselves together against Israel to battle," a natural introduction which we should expect in this place, but for that very reason suspicious, since it might easily be added by a copyist to fill out our brief and abrupt text. It is not unlikely, as Bib. Comm. suggests, that the account is taken from a fuller narrative, and is introduced here chiefly to set forth the fulfillment of the prophecy against Eli's house, that is, from the theocratic-prophetic point of view. See Erdmann's Introduction to this Comm. § 4. The Vulg. here agrees with the Sept., the other vss. with the Hebrew.—Tr.]

[2] [Two articles as in Jo. iii. 14; 2 Sam. xxiv. 5, to give prominence to each word.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 2. Chald.: "The combatants spread themselves out," Syr.: "there was a battle," Sept.: ἔκλινεν ὁ πόλεμος "the battle turned (against Isr.)," Vulg.: *inito certamine*, Erdmann: "*der Kampf ging los.*" The stem נטשׁ means "to put away, scatter;" here literally "the battle spread out," of which the rendering in Eng. A. V. is probably a fair equivalent. Thenius suggests that the Sept. read וַתֵּטֶשׁ, but Abarbanel also renders the verb by עָזַב "leave," as if the defeat of the Israelites was referred to.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 3. Sept. omits "covenant," and had a different text from ours, but it has no claim to reception.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 4. Sept. καθημένου χερουβίμ, Chald. and Syr. "on" (as in 2 Sam. xxii. 11), Vulg. "super."—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 4. Sept. omits "there" and thus gives a very good sense; Vulg. supports Sept., and Heb. is supported by Ch. and Syr. Wellhausen thinks the word was inserted from ch. i. 3.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 5. or "shook." So Erdmann: *erbebte.*—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 7. The Chald., to avoid seeming irreverence, has "the ark of God is come." The text of Sept. is here very bad.—Tr.]

9 plague] in the wilderness[9]? Be strong, and quit yourselves like men, O ye Philis-
tines, that ye be not servants unto the Hebrews, as they have been to you; quit
10 yourselves like men and fight. And the Philistines fought, and Israel was smitten,
and they fled every man to his tent [tents[10]]; and there was a very great slaughter
[the slaughter was very great], for [and] there fell of Israel thirty thousand foot-
11 men. And the ark of God was taken, and the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phine-
has, were slain [the two sons of Eli perished, Hophni and Phinehas.]

[9] [Ver. 8. To avoid the historical difficulty here LXX. and Syr. insert "and" and Chald. "and to his people wonders" before "in the wilderness." See Exeg. Notes *in loco*.—Tr.]
[10] [Ver. 10. Ch. "cities."—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. *Israel's march to battle against the Philistines* does not stand in pragmatical connection with the preceding words 'and the word of Samuel came to all Israel,' as if this latter meant a summons to war with the Philistines (as is held by most of the older expositors, and, among the later, by Keil and O. v. Gerlach.) Rather these words conclude and sum up the description of the origin and commencement of the prophet's work and of his announcement of the word of the Lord. We are now introduced immediately to the scene of the history, on which Samuel will henceforth appear as the Lord's instrument, a position he has reached by the call in ch. iii—iv. 1 a. The narrative sets us straightway into the midst of Israel's conflict with the Philistines. That the latter were now already in the land is assumed in the narrative, since not only is nothing said of an incursion by them, but the expression "the Israelites *went out against* the Philistines" in connection with the succeeding statement of the place of encampment points to the fact that the Philistines had already possessed themselves of the land.* In support of the view that Samuel summoned the Israelites to war *Clericus* remarks that he did it in God's name, that they might be punished by a defeat; but this is inconsistent with the divine justice. The pressure of the Philistine yoke, under which Israel groaned, was already a punishment from God. If this defeat also is so regarded, it can be only on the supposition that the Israelites hazarded this battle *not by God's will*, and therefore without a summons by Samuel. The name of the Israelitish camp, Ebenezer, is here given by anticipation, its origin being related in ch. vii. 12, on the occasion of the victory of the Israelites over the Philistines, twenty years after this defeat. According to vii. 12 it was near Mizpeh in Benjamin, Josh. xviii. 26; from which we must distinguish the Mizpeh in the lowland of Judah, Josh. xv. 38. *Aphek* cannot have been far from this, and is therefore "perhaps the same place with the Canaanitish royal city Aphek (Josh. xii. 18), and decidedly a different place from the Aphekah in the hill-country of Judah (Josh. xv. 53); for the latter lay south or southeast of Jerusalem, since, according to Josh. *loc. cit.*, it was one of the cities which lay in the neighborhood of Gibeon."† (Keil)—In ver. 2 an orderly battle-array on both sides is described. The וַתִּטֹּשׁ does not describe the spreading of the tumult of battle (as is clear from the following statement that the Israelites were beaten in the line of battle, and thence made an orderly retreat to their camp), but the sudden mutual assault of the opposing lines (Vulg.: *inito proelio*). It is said: "Israel was smitten *before* the Philistines," with reference to the *local* relation and the victorious superiority of the Philistines, but at the same time in respect of God's punishing hand which therein showed itself, as is expressly declared in v. 3.* The Israelites lost in the battle—"*in the field*," that is, in the plain, about 4000 men.

Ver. 3. After the return to the camp, it is assumed as a *fact* in the ensuing deliberation of the elders, *that* God had smitten them *before* the Philistines, and the *cause* is discussed. The *whole people* here appears as a *unit*, which is represented by the *elders*.—The *ark* here spoken of is no other than the Mosaic, the symbol of God's presence with His people, the place of His revelation to them. Cf. Ex. xxv. 16–22. When the Israelites say: "*We will fetch the ark of the Lord out of Shiloh unto us*, and *it shall come* into our midst and *save* us from our enemies," they assume that the Lord and the ark are inseparably connected, and that they can obtain His help against the foe, (of which they recognize their need), only by taking the ark along with them into battle. They connected the expected help essentially with the material vessel, instead of bowing in living, pure faith before the Lord, of whose revealing presence it was only a symbol, and crying to Him for His help. This is a heathenish feature in the religious life of the Israelites, and shows that their faith was obscured by superstition, there being no trace here of earnest self-examination with the question whether the cause of the defeat might not lie in God's holiness and justice thus revealing itself against their sins. Grotius therefore well remarks: "It is in vain that they trust in God, when *they are not purged from their sins*."

Ver. 4. Jehovah as covenant-God is more precisely designated in a twofold manner, corresponding to the situation, in which the Israelites desire His *almighty help*, which they think to be externally connected with the ark. As Jehovah *Sabaoth* He is the almighty ruler and commander of the *heavenly* powers. As Jehovah who "dwells above the Cherubim" [or, "is enthroned upon the Cherubim"—Tr.], He is the living God, the God of the completest fulness of power and life, who

* [On the chronology see Trans.'s note on p. 54. The dates are difficult, but the first battle of Ebenezer may be put approximately B. C. 1100, about the time of Samson's death, when Samuel was about 20 (or perhaps 30) years old. The third battle of Ebenezer (ch. vii.) falls about 1080.—Tr.]

† [Mr. Grove (in Smith's Dict. of the Bible) thinks it likely that the Aphek is the same as that mentioned in 1 Sam. xxix. 1, and different from the places mentioned in Josh. xii. and xv., but not far from Jerusalem on the north-west. But see on 1 Sam. xxix. 1.—Tr.]

* [This fact is not involved in the word *before*, which belongs to the common formula for a defeat, but is a part of the religious belief of the Israelites.—Tr.]

reveals Himself on *earth* in His glory, exaltedness and dominion over all the fulness of the life which has been called into existence by Him as Creator. The designation of God, "enthroned on the Cherubim," is never found except in relation to the *ark*, which is conceived of as the *throne* of the covenant-God who dwells as King in the midst of His people. Comp. Hengstenberg on the Pss., xcix. 1. The *Cherubim* are not representatives of the heavenly powers, since they are, as to form, made up of elements of the *living, animate, earthly* creation which culminates in *man*. Representing this, they *set forth*, in their position on the ark, the ruling might and majesty of the living God, as it is revealed over the manifoldness of the highest and completest life of the animate creation. In these two designations of God, then, reference is had to the *glory* and *dominion of God*, which embraces and high-exceeds all creaturely life in *heaven* and on *earth*, and whose saving interposition the Israelites made dependent on the presence of the ark. In sharpest contrast to this indication of God's loftiness and majesty stands the mention of the two priests Hophni and Phinehas, whose worthlessness has been before set forth, and who represent the whole of the moral corruption and sham religious life of the people. *They brought the ark*. *Berlenburger Bibel:* "taking the matter into their own hands, without consulting the Lord, and also without example, that what was testified of Hophni and Phinehas, ch. ii. 24, might be fulfilled." *The loud exulting cry* of the people* in the camp (ver. 5) was the expression of the joyful conviction that, now that the ark was with them in battle, victory would not fail. Probably this confidence was strengthened by the recollection of former glorious victories, gained under the presence of the ark in battle.

Vers. 6–9. **And the Philistines heard**, ver. 6sqq. The Philistines' camp was so near that of the Israelites that they could hear the latter's shout of joy. For this reason the Aphek, near which the Philistines now had their camp, cannot have been the Aphekah in the hill-country of Judah (Josh. xv. 53), which was south or southeast of Jerusalem, while, on the contrary, the Mizpah, near which we must put Ebenezer, was about four [English] miles northwest of Jerusalem.† Noteworthy is here the lively, distinct description of the contrasted tone of the Philistines, the psychological truth of which, in the transition of feeling from consternation to fear, from fear to despair, and from despair to encouragement was most strikingly confirmed. The victors must have been at first astonished and dismayed by the shout of joy of the vanquished. Their astonishment then must have turned into fear and terror, when they learned through scouts that "the ark of the Lord" had come into the camp of the Israelites. *First*, from their heathen stand-point, to which, as we have seen, that of the Israelites here approached very near, they saw therein the actual presence of the God of the Hebrews. "As all heathen feared to a certain extent the power of the gods of other nations, so also the Philistines feared the power of the god of the Israelites, and the more, that the fame of his deeds in former times had come to their ears." (Keil.) *Further*, they look from this dreaded god at the supposed dangerous position in which they now suddenly find themselves in contrast with their preceding success. As certainly as the Israelites see their victory in the ark of the Lord, so vividly do the Philistines, with the cry "woe to us!" conceive the defeat which the god of the Israelites will prepare for them. They even fall into *despair*. The thought of a possible averting of the threatened danger turns into a picturing of the invincibility of the God of the Israelites, and the impossibility of deliverance from him. The predicate "mighty" (אַדִּירִים) stands with *elohim* in the Plu. and not in the Sing., because here the polytheistic view of heathendom is set forth.* Calvin: "It is not strange that they say 'gods' in the plural, for unbelievers ever feign many gods. Therefore this is the speech of unbelieving men, ignorant of the truth. Though the Hebrew word is often used in the Scripture in the plural of the true and only God, yet in this case the attached adjectives and verbs are always in the Sing." "אֱלֹהִים (Elohim) is only used very frequently and purposely with the Plu., where polytheism or idolatry is meant, Ex. xxx. 11, 4, 8, 1 K. xii. 29, or a visible spirit (God), 1 Sam. xxviii. 13, or where heathen speak or are spoken to, Gen. xx. 13" (Ew. *Gr.* § 318 *a*).† The fear and despair of the Philistines were founded on the revelation of the irresistible power of this God in the history of the deliverance of the people of Israel out of Egypt. The acquaintance of the heathen nations with the wonderful demonstrations of the power of the God of Israel in this His deliverance was wide-spread. As this deliverance from Egypt was engraved indelibly in the religious consciousness of Israel, and is very often cited in the Old Testament as a type of all mighty self-revelations of God for the salvation of His people, so it was to the surrounding heathen nations the frightful instance of the invincible power of the God of Israel. This is stated, for example, in Ex. xv. 14sq. in reference to the Philistines: "The nations heard, they quaked, fear seized the inhabitants of Philistia," and in Josh. ii. 10 sq. "We have heard how Jehovah dried up the water of the Red Sea for you, when ye came out of Egypt . . . ., and when we heard it, our hearts melted, and there remained no longer courage in any man, because of you."—**With every kind of plague in the wilderness.**—As the "every kind of plague" can only refer to the plagues inflicted by God on Egypt before the exodus of Israel, and the "in the wilderness," which can mean only the catastrophe in the Red Sea, does not agree with this, Sept. and Syriac have inserted "and" before "in the wilderness;" and Bunsen accepts this as probable, in order to refer the "and in the wilderness" to the destruction in the Red Sea. Against this Böttcher rightly

* [It was the army that here acted, rather than the people in a political capacity; but the word "people" perhaps points to the absence of a regular army.—Tr.]

† [Neby Samwil, which is identified by Robinson with Mizpah, is about five miles from Jerusalem. Bonar and Stanley prefer Scopus (about a mile from Jerusalem), as the site, and this view is favored by Mr. Grove. Smith's *Bib. Dict.* s. v. Mizpah.—Tr.]

* [And, therefore, it should be rendered plural—"mighty gods," and not, as Erdmann in his translation, *dieses mächtigen Gottes*, "this mighty god."—Tr.]

† [But see Gen. i. 26, xi. 7, xx. 13, 2 Sam. vii. 22, Ps. lviii. 12, where the renderings "gods," "deity," *etc.* are not quite satisfactory.—Tr.]

remarks: "the *wherewith* and the *where* of two actions are not usually so connected by *and*." So against Ewald's expedient, to insert "in their land" before "and in the wilderness," Böttcher excellently says, that this would be very tame and flat, that there was no occasion for the supposed omission, and that the expression "with every kind of plague" cannot in any case suit the destruction in the Red Sea, even if the word מַכָּה "blow" should be applied to the downfall of the army. Böttcher proposes to remove the difficulty by two insertions, of "and" before "in the wilderness," and after the latter phrase some expression of a greater demonstration of power, as "destroyed them" (הֶאֱבִידוּם) from Deut. xi. 4, but this is too bold. Over against such arbitrary additions to the difficult text, it is by no means a "worthless expedient," as Thenius calls it, if we suppose that the narrator represents the Philistines as expressing their incorrect and confused view, which corresponds also psychologically with the excitement and precipitation with which they here speak. There is a sort of zeugma here, the recollections of two facts, the plagues and the destruction in the Red Sea, being combined into *one* expression, whence results a statement in itself incorrect. Keil thinks that, according to the view of the Philistines, all God's miracles for the deliverance of Israel were wrought in the wilderness, because Israel had dwelt in the land of Goshen *on the border* of the wilderness; but the phrase "in the wilderness" is against this. A confusion of view in the Philistines, and an exact relation of it by the narrator may be the more readily assumed, because, on the one hand, the Philistines were not investigators of history, and from their heathen stand-point, had no interest in an exact statement of those remote miracles of God for Israel, and, on the other hand, for these words of the Philistines the narrator had [possibly] before him a lyric-like song of real lamentation, as the Philistines then uttered it; just as, on the Israelitish side, he had similar bits of poetry in David's lament over Jonathan, and in the song of the women on David's victory. In ver. 9 the tone of fear, of despair, which had hitherto shown itself, suddenly, and without cause, turns to the opposite. Clericus' insertion, "others said," is, certainly, inadmissible; but, from the context, it hardly admits of doubt, that here different speakers from the former are introduced, that now the leaders enter, and, with encouraging words, urge the terrified body of the army to bold struggle. The repeated "*be men!*" is set over against the twofold expression of despondency "*woe to us!*" The "*be strong—fight!*" is directed against the "*who will save us?*" The reference to the *disgrace*, which subjection would bring on the Philistines as servants of the Israelites, is based on the pride of the people, and its force is strengthened by reference to the dependency, on the other hand, of the Israelites on them. Comp. Judg. xiii. 1. It is a martial, curt, energetic word, which is in striking contrast with the wide lamentation just heard, and therefore cannot have come from the same mouth as that. The false, secure, superstitious reliance of the Israelites on the present ark, their advance to battle not in the fear of the Lord and in proper trust in Him, and the newly-kindled courage of the Philistines resulted in terrible defeat of the former; the defeat was very *great*, especially in comparison with the first, in which 4000 fell. The result of the battle was 1) for the Israelitish *army* a complete dispersion ("every man fled to his tents") with the terrific loss of 30,000 footmen (the Israelitish army consisted at this time of footmen only); 2) for the *ark*, its *capture* by the Philistines, and 3) for the *sons of Eli*, death. Thus a terrible divine judgment was executed on Israel and its whole religious system, dead, as it was, and void of the presence of the living God. The priesthood was judged in its unworthy representatives; the loss of the ark to the heathen was the sign that the living God does not bind His presence to a dead thing, and withdraws its helpfulness and blessings where covenant-faithfulness to Him is wanting; the mighty army was destroyed, because it had not the living, Almighty God as leader and protector, and He gave Israel, as a punishment of their degeneracy, into the power of the enemy.*

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The Tabernacle was, according to the divine arrangement, to be the consecrated place, where the covenant-God, dwelling among His people, would be enthroned in the revelation of His holiness, mercy and majesty; according to its designation, it was "the place where God met with the people." It contravened, therefore, this sacred ordination of God, that Israel should without authority separate the sacred tent and the ark that belonged to it, and drag the latter into the tumult of battle, under the superstitious impression that, removed from the quiet holy place where the people assembled, and where they met with God, it would secure the mighty intervention of God. Thereby was God's holy method of meeting with His people disturbed and destroyed. For the space outside the Holy Place and the Most Holy was the appointed place where the people assembled and drew near to God through the priesthood; and the place of the priests, symbolizing their mediating office, was between the court and the Most Holy Place; and the Most Holy Place, symbolizing God's dwelling enthroned amid His people, did this for the whole sanctuary and for the theocratic people only through "the ark of the covenant or of the testimony," and through its symbolic representation of God's gracious presence; and therefore the removal of the ark of God from this consecrated place, and its separation from what was intimately connected with it by the idea of the indwelling of God in His people and their meeting together, not only stripped the Holy of Holies of its holy meaning, but also destroyed the whole order and comprehensive aim of the sanctuary. According to this divine order and aim, the people were here to draw near to their God. The people here, on the contrary, demand that God shall come to His people with His help, while they have not approached Him with penitence and humility, with prayer and sacrifice. Herein is set forth the deepest inward corruption of the priestly office, which not only did not prevent, but positively

* [These two battles are the first and second battles of Ebenezer; for the third, see 1 Sam. vii.—Tr.]

permitted such an inversion of the theocratic order.

2. The *ark*, as the most essential part of the sanctuary, whose signification as "dwelling of God" it alone fully expressed, was the symbol of God's presence with His people in the chief aspects of His self-revelation as covenant-God: *first* in His *holiness* and *justice*, the *testimony* of which in the covenant-record of the Law as the revelation of the holy and righteous will of God to His people, formed the content of the ark; *secondly*, in His *grace and mercy*, indicated by its cover, the kapporeth [mercy-seat], as the symbol of God's merciful love, which covered the sin of His penitent people; and *thirdly*, in His *royal majesty and glory*, whose consoling and terrifying presence over the cover of the ark was symbolized by the cherubic forms. These forms are to be regarded, not as a symbolical representation of real personal existences of a higher spirit-world (Kurtz, Keil), but, both in the simpler shape in which the human form is the prominent and governing one (Ex. xxv.), and in the more elaborate composite form, as in Ezekiel (ch. i.), as the symbolical representation of the majesty of God (presented in full glory to the covenant-people), as it is set forth in the completest creaturely life of the earthly creation. The people of Israel, *evil*-counselled by their elders (ver. 3), *un*counselled by their high-priest, perverted now the saving covenant-order symbolized by the ark thus constituted, in that, by the external conveyance of the ark into the battle, they severed the mighty unfolding of God's majesty and glory against His enemies and His saving presence from the ethical condition necessary on their part—that is, in that they did not observe covenant-fidelity in obedience to the law of God, nor sought His grace and mercy in sincere penitence, but rather, in fleshly security and in dead, superstitiously degenerate religious service, deluded themselves into believing that God's presence would secure protection and help without the moral condition of obedience to His holy will, without penitent approach to Him, and without free appropriation of His offered grace, and that it was, in its essence and working, connected with the sensely and natural. This was in open contradiction to the fundamental view of the religion of Israel, by which the idea that God dwelt above the ark amid His people in a sensely way was excluded.

3. The unauthorized, self-determined inversion of the holy order,* in which is founded the fellowship of God with man and of man with God, is followed by the opposing manifestation of God's punitive justice. It does not suffice to see and confess, like the elders of Israel, under the pain of self-incurred misfortune and misery, the revelation therein of the smiting hand of the almighty God; but there must be joined with this the penitent, sorrowful recognition of our own sin as its cause, and the penitent seeking after God's mercy and help, of which there is no trace in the people and their elders. He who does not, by penitence, living trust in His mercy and obedience, make himself absolutely dependent on God and subject to Him, comes by his own fault into this inverted relation to Him, that he seeks to make Him, the holy and righteous God, subject *to himself*, and to secure His helping grace according to His own perverse will. Theodoret says in *Quæst. in I. Reg. Interrog.* X.: "By the loss of the ark God taught the Hebrews that they could rely on His providence only when they lived obedient to His law, and when they transgressed His law, could rely neither on Him nor on the sacred ark."—*Berl. Bibel* on ver. 2: "The *elders* were right in recognizing the fact that *the Lord had smitten* them (Am. iii. 6). But they were arch-hypocrites in that they did not lay the blame on themselves, and make a resolution to cleanse themselves from sin and idolatry (vii. 3, 4), and turn to the Lord in downright earnest and with the whole heart, but only counselled to carry the *ark of the covenant* into battle, put their trust in the outward, and so directed the people. If only the ark were with them, thought they, the Lord must help them. Very differently did David, and in his deep need would hold directly on the Lord; therefore he had the ark of the Lord carried back into Jerusalem (2 Sam. xv. 24 seq.). But they had to learn also that, as they had let obedience to the Lord go, so the Lord would let these outward signs go, with which He was not so much concerned as with obedience.—Out of God we seek in vain for help; nothing can protect us against His wrath. We must give ourselves up to Him, and that is the best means of quieting His anger. And we must so give ourselves up to Him, that we do not once think of trying to quiet His anger."

4. There is a merely fleshly natural joy in the external affairs and ordinances of religious life and service, in that we think of and use these, not as means of glorifying God and furthering His honor, but as means of satisfying vain desires, selfish wishes and earthly-human ends. The Lord punishes such pretence, not only by thwarting these ends, but by sending the opposite, privation and distress, and even taking away the outward supports and forms of hypocritical godliness and piety, as the ark was taken from the Israelites by the Philistines. "He who has, to him shall be given; and he that has not, from him shall be taken what he has." [Wordsworth refers, for a similar state of things, to Jer. vii. 4 sq.—Tr.]

5. It is one of the weightiest laws in the Kingdom of God, that when His people, who profess His name, do not show covenant-fidelity in faith and obedience, but, under cover of merely external piety, serve Him in appearance only, being in heart and life far from Him, He gives them up for punishment to the world, before which they have not magnified the honor of His name, but have covered it with reproach.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 1, 2. *Berlenb. Bible:* Israel smitten before the Philistines, is to-day also the spectacle presented by the condition of God's people. The enemies of the Divine name, the hostile powers of darkness have for the most part the upper

* [We must guard, however, against laying too much stress on the ceremonial, symbolical order, which David violated (1 Sam. xxi.) without wrong. The Israelites were punished, not because they violated symbolic logic in removing the ark from the sanctuary, but because their whole religious life was perverted and disobedient. This was only the occasion of the lesson.—Tr.]

hand. Anxiety about sustenance or love for earthly things everywhere plays the master, and even the best Israelites are thereby overcome and made to fall.—STARKE: It is indeed not wrong to defend ourselves against the enemy who attacks us; but such defense must be undertaken in true penitence, that we may have a reconciled God and His assistance.

Vers. 3. 4. STARKE: In the punishments of God men seldom think of their sins committed, but only of outward means of turning away the punishments, Deut. xxvi. 18; Ps. lxxviii. 56-62. SCHMID: Hypocrites leave the appointed way, and wish to prescribe to God how He shall help them.

[Ver. 3. *Failure in religious enterprises*, as in efforts to evangelize a particular community, or in some field of home or foreign missions. We are prone to see only the external *causes* of such failure, instead of perceiving and lamenting our lack of devotion and spirituality, and to ask, as if surprised or complaining, "Wherefore has the Lord smitten us before the Philistines?" And in seeking *remedies*, we are apt merely to hunt out striking novelties in outward agencies, instead of forsaking our sins and crying for God's mercy and help. Such novelties may be employed, provided *a*) they are lawful in themselves, and *b*) we do not take it for granted they will be accompanied by God's presence and blessing.—Ver. 4. *The tabernacle* and its leading contents, 1) as symbols of God's manifested presence, His majesty, justice, and mercy, and of the need of purification, sacrifice, and priestly intercession in approaching Him; and 2) as foreshadowing the incarnation of God's Son, and His work of atonement and intercession.—TR.]

Ver. 5. OSIANDER: So joyful are the ungodly in their carnal security that they let themselves dream of a happy issue, while yet they do not think of repentance and reformation of life. [HALL: Those that regarded not the God of the ark, think themselves safe and happy in the ark of God.—TR.].—BERLENB. BIBLE: The holiest things and the most precious institutions of the Lord may, as we here see, be most horribly misused contrary to God's intention, and bring on men the utmost ruin, if they are not handled and read in a holy way and according to the will of God. How clearly is here depicted that false confidence of hypocritical Christians, which they place in outward signs, yea, in Christ Himself, without true repentance and reformation of life.

Vers. 7, 8. SCHMID: Even the mere rumor of God and of His works fills the ungodly with fear; how much more God's written Word. God convinces even unbelievers of His majesty, that they may have no excuse, Rom. i. 20.

Ver. 9. STARKE: O ye children of God, do learn here by the example of the Philistines, that as they encourage one another for the conflict against God's people, you, on the contrary, may encourage yourselves for the conflict against the children of Satan, Eph. vi. 10 sq.—SCHMID: So desperately wicked is the human heart, that it opposes itself to God in perfect desperation rather than submit itself to Him in repentance.

Vers. 10, 11. STARKE: When the ungodly have filled up the measure of their sins, God's anger and punishment is sure to strike them.—SCHMID: When unbelievers show themselves so brave that it appears as if they had overcome God and His people, they gain nothing by it except that they at least experience God's heavy vengeance.—WUERTEMBERG BIBLE: The outward signs of God's grace are to the impenitent utterly unprofitable, Jer. vii. 4, 5.—TUEBINGEN BIBLE: God often punishes a people by taking away the candlestick of His word from its place, Rev. ii. 5. —SCHLIER: The Lord's arm would first chastise the secure and presumptuous people, before help could be given; the blows of the Philistines were the Lord's rods of chastening. But there also was help near to those who would only open their eyes, for the Lord's chastisements are meant to be unto salvation. And Israel was soon to be able to see that with their eyes. The Lord had chastised His people; but they were not to despair or to perish.—[HALL: The two sons of Eli, which had helped to corrupt their brethren, die by the hands of the uncircumcised, and are now too late separated from the ark of God by Philistines, which should have been before separated by their father. They had lived formerly to bring God's altar into contempt, and now live to carry His ark into captivity; and at last, as those that had made up the measure of their wickedness, are slain in their sin.—TR.]

II. *The Judgment on the House of Eli.* Chap. IV. 12–22.

12 AND there ran a man of Benjamin[1] out of the army, and came to Shiloh the
13 same day with his clothes rent, and with earth upon his head. And when [*om.*
when] he came [*ins.* and] lo, Eli sat upon a [his[2]] seat by the wayside[3] watching;
for his heart trembled for the ark of God. And when [*om.* when] the man came
into the city and told it [came, in order to tell it in the city] [*ins.* and] all the city

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 12. Instead of the Gen. construction, as here, the Heb. has more commonly the tribal name as Adj. (gentilic), as in Judg. iii. 15; 2 Sam. xx. 1; but for ex. of this form see Judg. x. 1.—TR.]

[2] [Ver. 13. The Art. here points to some well-known or accustomed seat.—TR.]

[3] [Ver. 13. It is generally agreed that we must here read, with the Qeri and Syr., יד instead of יך, but the

14 cried out. And when [*om.* when] Eli heard the noise of the crying, he [*om.* he,
ins. and] said, What *meaneth* the noise of this tumult? And the man came in
15 hastily [hasted and came] and told Eli. Now Eli was ninety and eight[4] years old.
16 and his eyes were dim [set] that he could not see. And the man said unto Eli, I
am he that came out of the army, and I fled to-day out of the army. And he said,
17 What is there done, my son? And the messenger answered and said, Israel is
fled before the Philistines, and there hath been also a great slaughter among the
people, and thy two sons also, Hophni and Phinehas, are dead, and the ark of God
18 is taken. And it came to pass, when he made mention of the ark of God, that he
fell from off the seat backward by the side[5] of the gate, and his neck brake, and he
died; for he was an old man [the man was old], and heavy. And he had judged
19 Israel forty[6] years. And his daughter-in-law, Phinehas' wife, was with child, near
to be delivered;[7] and when she heard the tidings that the ark of God was taken,
and that her father-in-law and her husband were dead, she bowed herself and tra-
20 vailed, for her pains came upon her. And about the time of her death the women
that stood by her said, Fear not; for thou hast borne a son. But she answered
21 not, neither did she regard it. And she named the child Ichabod, saying "The
glory is departed from Israel," because the ark of God was taken, and because of
22 her father-in-law and her husband. And she said, The glory is departed from
Israel, for the ark of God is taken.

absence of the Art. in דרך makes a difficulty, and the Sept. and Chald. seem to have rendered from a slightly different text. Sept. has: "Eli was near the gate, watching the way," and Chald.: "Eli sat in the path of the way of the gate watching." So in ver. 18 the Heb. text "side of the gate." It would seem probable, therefore, that הַשַּׁעַר "the gate" has fallen out here.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 15. Sept. here gives 90 years, and Syr. (followed by Arab.) 78.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 18. Wellhausen objects to בְּעַד יַד, rejects the עַד as repetition by error, and reads כְּיַד. But this is unnecessary; comp. the אֶל in 2 Sam. xviii. 4, and the force of בְּעַד in Job ii. 4.—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 18. Sept. gives 20 years, other vers. 40.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 19. לַת for לֵדֵת, the only place where this contraction occurs (so Rashi).—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 12 sq. The persons and events of the following narrative are described with peculiar vividness, so that we may here without doubt suppose the narration to rest on the direct account of an eye-witness. **A man of Benjamin.**—Thenius: "This exact statement vouches for a faithful tradition." That he comes with *mournful tidings* is shown by his *rent garment* and the *earth* strown on his head, as signs of sudden deep grief, in which the heart is rent with sorrow. Comp. Gen. xxxvii. 29, 34; Numb. xiv. 6; Josh. vii. 6; 2 Sam. xv. 32; Ezek. xxvii. 30.*—**To Shiloh** the man came straight from the army (מַעֲרָכָה, Vulg. *ex acie*). According to the Jewish tradition† this man was Saul, who snatched from Goliath the Tables of the Law, taken out of the ark, in order to save them. Instead of the יַךְ (he slew) of the text, which is unintelligible, we must read יַד (side)‡: **He sat by the side of the way, watching.** Thenius remarks: "What a strange expression!" But the sitting *in* the way, or *on the side* of the way by which the first messenger must come, answers precisely to the intense expectation in which Eli, though blind, had taken this position, so as, if not with the eyes (which, however, had perhaps still a glimmer of light), yet with the sense of hearing to learn straightway the arrival of the first messenger. Eli sits, as in ch. i. 9 at the inner, so here at the outer gate of the Sanctuary, on his seat,* and, as appears from ver. 18, on the side of the gate, which was also, therefore, the side of the adjacent way.—**His heart was heavy,** not merely "from anxiety and care for the ark, which without divine command he had let go from its dwelling-place into the camp" (Berl. Bib.), but also in respect to the issue of the battle itself for the people of Israel.—Eli's blindness explains the fact that he failed to observe the messenger, who ran hurriedly by† without noticing him. It is the cry of lamentation, raised by the people of Shiloh at his news, that directs Eli's attention to the announcement. His question concerning the loud outcry around him, on which the messenger came to inform him, is explained in ver. 15 by reference to his

*[On the importance of "runners" see note in Bib. Comm. on this verse, which remarks also, that as the messenger came from Ebenezer within the day (ver. 16) it must have been near.—Tr.]

†[See Talmudical Tract Sota, and the Midrash of Samuel, and comms. of Rashi and Abarbanel.—Tr.]

‡[See "Textual and Grammatical" note on this word.—Tr.]

*[This word (כִּסֵּא) everywhere else clearly means "throne" (unless perhaps in 1 Ki. ii. 19; Ps. ix. 14), and comp. Zech. vi. 13. Yet, in the infrequent occurrence of any word for an ordinary seat (and see Ez. xxviii. 2, מוֹשַׁב א' "seat of God"), though the word seems to imply something of official dignity, the rendering throne (Josephus: ἐφ' ὑψηλοῦ θρόνου) would here be not so good as "seat."—Tr.]

†[The messenger probably entered the city by the gate where Eli was sitting.—Tr.]

blindness, the result of old age.—**Eli was 98 years old, and his eyes were set.** (The Fem. Sing. קָמָה with עֵינָיו is explained, according to Ewald, § 317 *a*, by the abstract conception which connects itself with the Plu. of the Subst. by the combination into an abstract idea of the individuals embraced in it, "especially in lifeless objects, beasts, or in co-operating members of *one* body, in which the action of the individuals is not so prominent—and so in the Dual," as here). For "*were set*" comp. 1 Kings xiv. 4, where occurs the same expression for blindness caused by old age. It is the vivid description of the lifeless, motionless appearance of the eye quenched by senile weakness, "a description of the so-called black cataract, amaurosis, which usually ensues in great old age from the feebleness of the optic nerves" (Keil, *in loco*). In iii. 2 the process of this blinding is indicated by the word כהה as "waxing dim."

Ver. 16 sq. *The sorrowful tidings.* The remark in ver. 15 concerning Eli's senile weakness and blindness explains both the preceding ver. 14 and the statement in ver. 16 as to the way in which the messenger personally announces and introduces himself with the words: **I am he that came out of the army.**—But he says, "I am he that came" not merely on account of Eli's blindness, but also on account of the importance of the announcement with which he approaches the head of the whole people. It is not allowable, therefore, to translate: "I come" (De Wette). At the same time the messenger declares himself a *fugitive*, and so intimates that the army is completely broken up. *Eli's question* refers not to the *How* (how stood the affair? De Wette, Bunsen), but to the *What:* "What was the affair?" (Thenius), Vulg.: *quid actum est?—The answer of the messenger to Eli's* question (ver. 17) contains nothing but *facts in a fourfold grade*, each statement more dreadful than the preceding. There is a power in these words which comes out in four sharp sentences, with blow after blow, till its force is crushing: Israel *fleeing* before the Philistines, a great *slaughter* among the people, *Eli's sons* dead, the *ark taken*. The double "and also" (וגם) is to be observed here as characteristic of the lapidary style of the words, and the excitement with which they were spoken.—The narrator remarks expressly that the fourth blow, the news of the capture of the ark by the heathen, led to Eli's death. This is again a sign of the fear of God, which was deeply rooted in his heart; the ark represented the honor and glory of the God who dwelt in His people; the people's honor and power might perish; the destruction of his house might be irretardable, unavoidable; prepared beforehand for it, he had said: "It is the Lord, let him do as seemeth him good!" But the loss of the ark to the heathen was his death-blow the more surely, the firmer had been his hope that, as of old in the time of Moses and Joshua, the host of Israel would win the victory over the Philistines under the lead of the ark which he, a weak guardian of the Sacred Vessel, had sent off to the battle without Divine command, weakly yielding to the elders of the people whose trust was not in the living God. His judicial and high-priestly office, lacking as it was in honor and renown, he closed with honor; though the manner of his death was terrible, and bore the mark of a divine judgment, he nevertheless died in the fear of God. Berl. Bib.: "It is besides an honorable and glorious death to die from care for God's honor." His judgeship had lasted 40 years. The Sept. reading, 20 years for 40, results, according to Thenius, from the confusion of the numeral letters מ and כ, as the reading 78 (Syr., Arab.) for 98 in ver. 15, according to the same critic, may be due to the confusion of צ and ע. Further, our text "is sustained by the fact that Eli hardly became Judge in his 78th year" (Thenius).

Vers. 19 sq. Here follows the pathetic narrative of *Eli's daughter-in-law*, in which is shown how the judgment on Eli's house is still farther fulfilled in his *family*.* The wife of Phinehas was so violently affected by the horror and sorrow that her pains came prematurely on her. Literally it reads: "her pains turned upon her," or "began to turn themselves within her." This expression is suggested by the ground-meaning of the word (צִירִים), "something turning, winding, circling."—Ver. 20. The comforting word of the women who stood by: "thou hast borne a son" does not rouse the mother's joy in her heart, and cannot overcome or soften its sorrow at the loss of the ark, which is more to her than the loss of husband and father-in-law—and this is set forth by two expressions in the narration: "she gave no answer, and laid it not to heart," did not set her mind on it. Comp. Ps. lxii. 11 שׂוּם לֵב. What is commonly for a mother's heart at such a time the greatest joy (Jno. xvi. 21), was for her as if it were not; so is her soul occupied and taken up with sorrow for the lost ark. This shows the earnest, sincere piety, in which she is like her father-in-law. Eli's house, made ripe by his weakness for so frightful a judgment, was not in *all* its members personally a partaker of the godlessness and immorality of those who certainly, before the Lord and the whole nation, stamped it as ripe for God's righteous punishment. "The wife of this deeply corrupt man shows how penetrated the whole people then was with the sense of the value of its covenant with God" (O. v. Gerlach).†—Ver. 21. She gives expression to what fills her heart by naming the child *Ichabod*. This name is not "where is

---

* The לְ before לַת — לֵדֶת is that of *time*, our *towards, on, about;* comp. Josh. ii. 5, "the gate was for closing," that is, was to be closed immediately; Ew. *Gr.* 217, 2 *b*. So here: towards bearing, near to bearing. On the contraction of לֵדֶת into לַת comp. Ew. *Gr.* § 236, 1 *b*, and § 80.—אֶל is often used, as here, to point out the object to which the narration relates—with the verbs "say, relate." Comp. Gen. xx. 2; Ps. ii. 7; lxix. 27; Is. xxxviii. 19; Jer. xxvii. 19; Job xlii. 7. It is explained by the fact that, in narrating or speaking, the mind is directed to the object, stands in relation to it. Comp. לְ Isa. v. 1. That it here depends on a subst., and not, as usually, on a verb, does not affect the principle, since a verbal conception lies in this subst.

† [We can hardly draw a conclusion concerning the whole nation from the example of one person, and Gerlach's inference is, for other reasons, doubtful.—Tr.]

glory?" (אִי כָ׳), that is, nowhere, but it = "not glory."* She explains the name Not-glory, Un-glory by saying (לֵאמֹר): "the glory of Israel is carried into captivity." (The אֶל, as in verse 19, is "in reference to," "having regard to," and belongs to לֵאמֹר as the continuation of the words of the narrator, not of the dying woman). The narrator has in mind her words, on which she based that ejaculation, but does not state them as hers till afterwards; *here* he states beforehand the fact contained in them as a historical explanation. We must note, however, the difference between *his* explanation and *her* reason for that exclamation in ver. 22. While he mentions the reference (אֶל) to the two dead, *she* bases the name (כִּי) on the one thing only, the capture of the ark. The *honor* or *glory* is the *divine majesty*, the glory of God, which is enthroned above the ark. Grotius: "The ark above which God was accustomed to appear in glory." With the capture of the ark "Israel's glory is carried into captivity;" "with the abandonment of the earthly throne of His glory, the Lord seemed to have annulled His covenant of grace with Israel; for the ark, with the tables of the law and the *kapporeth* [mercy-seat], was the visible pledge of the covenant of grace which Jehovah had made with Israel" (Keil). Eli's son's wife dies, as Eli himself, in consuming sorrow over what was the core of this national and domestic misfortune, over the judgment of the turning away of the almighty living God from the covenant-people, the outward sign of which was the removal of the ark, on which, in accordance with His promise given in the law, He would sit as Israel's God and dwell in the midst of His people. Comp. Ex. xxv. 22; xxx. 6, 36; xl. 35 ("the glory of the Lord filled the dwelling"), 1 Kings viii. 10, 11. [*Bib. Comm.* refers to Ps. lxxviii. 61, 64 as containing allusions to this incident. Wordsworth: "With God there is no Ichabod."—Tr.] "The necessary result of this national view of the ark is that there was only one sanctuary, so that all those passages which affirm it may be cited as direct testimony to the fact that there was only one sanctuary." (Hengst. *Beit.* [*Contrib.*] III. 55.)

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. In the history of His kingdom on earth God the Lord often permits times to come, when it seems as if the victory had been forever borne away from His people by the hostile world, and the holy ordinances of His kingdom, and its gracious benefits forever abandoned to the power of unbelief. Such times are times of judgment on the house of the Lord, the purpose of which is to make manifest all who truly belong to the Lord's people, to put an end to the hypocrisy of dead belief and of the unbelief which is concealed under outward forms and the appearance of godliness, to lead to earnest, honest repentance, and bring men to seek again God's mercy in true living faith.

* אִי is not אֵבִי contracted, as in אִיעֶזֶר, Nu. xxvi. 30; Ew. § 84 c, but = "not," "without," Ew. § 273 b, A. 1, p. 667, comp. § 209 c, to which the context points.

2. Outcry over inbreaking outward and inward corruption, in which God's judgments are inflicted, is nothing but an expression of the sorrow which flesh and blood feels, a sign of the distance and alienation of the fleshly heart from God, unless therein the cry is heard: "It is the Lord, this the Lord hath done," and the confession is made: "We have deserved it by our sins," and unless recourse is had in penitence and faith to God's grace and mercy. And all this was lacking in the outcry of that whole city and its loud tumult.

3. "Being in God"—that is, the union of the heart with Him in the deepest foundation of its being, reveals itself in times of great misfortune and suffering in this, that the sorrow and mourning is not restricted to the loss of earthly-human possessions, but directs itself chiefly to the loss and lack of God's gracious presence, and thus shows that for the inner life the glory of God and blessedness in communion with Him is become the highest good. So here in this refraining from grief over the loss of what to the flesh was the nearest and dearest, and in the outspoken sorrow only over the violence done to God's honor and the contempt cast on His name, is verified the Lord's word: "He who forsaketh not father or mother, or brother, *etc.*, is not worthy of me."

4. Eli and his son's wife are shining examples of true heartfelt piety in the gloom of the corruption that reigned in the high-priestly family and the judgments that came on it, in that they are not taken up with their own interests, but bewail the violation of the sanctuary, the contempt put on God's honor as the highest misfortune; and so in times of universal confusion and degradation which God the Lord lets befall His kingdom in this world, He has always His people in secret, who look not on their own need and tribulation as most to be lamented, but sorrow most deeply and heavily that the ends of His grace are thwarted, the honor of His name violated, and the affairs of His kingdom in confusion.

5. Even a sudden terrible death under the stroke of a merited judgment of God may be a blessed death in the living God, if the heart breaks with the cry: "To God alone the glory!"

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 12. The outward signs of mourning, such as were usual among the people of Israel—rending the garments and putting ashes or dust on the head—ought to be a symbolical representation of godly sorrow for sin, in which the heart is broken to pieces by the word of the holy and righteous God, and the whole man casts himself humbly and penitently into the dust before his God. [Very fanciful.—Tr.] But, as then under the oppression of Philistine rule in Israel, there is nowhere a trace to be found of such repentance, when the misfortune over which men mourn and lament is not regarded and felt as a punishment of God for sin, and the smiling hand of the righteous and holy God is not therein recognized.

Ver. 13. S. Schmid: We must take care not to do any thing with a doubtful conscience, that we may not have always to stand in fear, Rom. xiv. 23.—Those who will not cry out over their sins

in true repentance must at last cry out over the punishment and their misfortune.

Vers. 17, 18. STARKE: When men sin without distinction, God also punishes without distinction, and regards no person, dignity, age, nor condition, Wisdom vi. 7.—S. SCHMID: The honor of God and the true service of God must lie more on our hearts than our own children and parents.—BERL. BIBLE: It is a wonderful thing that whereas the people were so powerful and had gained so many victories, as long as God protected them, they now fly and let themselves be overcome almost without a struggle, as soon as ever God ceases to be on their side. If God protects us in a special way, we are a match for our enemies; but if He leaves us only for a little to ourselves, into what weaknesses do we not then fall! So that we unite with our enemies in contributing much to our downfall.—We must, however, regard it as an effect of God's compassion when He permits us to be smitten. For if this did not happen, we should not sufficiently recognize our weakness, and our great need of His assistance.—It is an honorable and glorious death to die from concern for the honor of God.—Vers. 21, 22. BERLEB. BIBLE: As soon as we lose this presence (God's), we fall into the utmost weakness and into powerlessness, so that we can no more do what we have done before. We also cease to be a terror to our enemies; for these, on the contrary, now rejoice over our defeat.—WUNDERLICH (in DAECHSEL): So prevalent in Israel was a regard for the glory of God, which streamed down upon the people, so deeply implanted was the theocratic national consciousness that a woman in travail forgot her pains, and a dying woman the terrors of death, a mother did not comfort herself in her new-born son, and sorrow for the lost jewel of the nation outweighed even sorrow for the death of a father and of a husband, and this in a family and in a period which must be regarded as degenerate.

Vers. 12–22. *A terrible and yet an honorable end*—if 1) With the humble confession "It is the Lord" the hand of God as it smites down is *held back;* 2) In complete unselfishness one's own misfortune and ruin is *quite forgotten* over the shame brought upon the honor and the name of God; and 3) The hidden man of the heart, with all his striving, turns himself alone towards the honor and glory of God *as his supreme good.*—*The defeats of God's people in the conflict with the world which is hostile to His kingdom.* 1) Their *causes: a*) on *their* side: unfaithfulness towards the Lord, arbitrary, self-willed entrance into the strife without God, cowardice and flight; *b*) on *God's* side: punitive justice, abandonment to the hands of their enemies. 2 Their necessary *consequences:* deep hurt to the yet remaining life of faith, injury to the honor of God, and shame brought upon His glorious name. 3) The *results contemplated* by God in permitting them, or their *design:* sincere repentance, all the more zealous care for the Lord's honor, glorifying His name so much the more.—*Without honor to God no honor to the people:* 1) In the *inner* life of the people—error and heterodoxy, where the light of His revealed truth does not shine, sin and unrighteousness, where there is a lack of faithful obedience to His holy will, spiritual-moral wretchedness and ruin, where God must withdraw His gracious presence; 2) In the *outer* life of the people in relation to other peoples, oppression and subjection, introduction from without of godlessness and immorality, loss of their good name.—*The cry, Ichabod, the glory is departed from Israel,* is a cry which 1) as a *lamenting cry,* is grounded in the proper recognition of the *cause, greatness* and *significance* of the ruin and wretchedness which come from being abandoned by God, and 2) as an *awakening cry* is designed to admonish to earnest repentance and returning to the Lord, that the light of His glory may again break forth out of the gloom.

[Vers. 19–22. The pious wife of Phinehas. 1) Pious, though living in an age of general corruption. 2) Deeply pious, though the wife of a grossly wicked husband. 3) So pious, that in her devout grief all other strongest feelings were swallowed up: *a*) maternal feeling, *b*) conjugal and filial feeling, *c*) patriotic feeling.—TR.]

III. *The Ark and the Philistines.* Chap. V. 1–VII. 1.

1. The Chastisement of the Philistines for the Removal of the Ark.

CHAP. V. 1–12.

1 AND the Philistines took the ark of God, and brought it from Ebenezer unto
2 Ashdod. When [And] the Philistines took the ark of God,[1] they [and] brought
3 it into the house of Dagon, and set it by Dagon. And when [*om.* when] they of
Ashdod arose early on the morrow,[2] [*ins.* and] behold, Dagon was fallen upon his
face to the earth before the ark of the Lord [Jehovah]. And they took Dagon, and
4 set him in his place again. And when [*om.* when] they arose early on the morrow

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Vers. 2 and 4. This verbal repetition is quite after the manner of Hebrew historical writing.—TR.]
[2] [Ver. 3. Here Sept. inserts: "and went into Dagon's house and saw,"—a very natural explanation, but, for that very reason, suspicious as the probable addition of a copyist or annotator.—TR.]

morning,[1] [*ins.* and] behold, Dagon was fallen upon his face to the ground [earth]
before the ark of the Lord [Jehovah], and the head of Dagon and both the palms
of his hands were cut off upon the threshold; only *the stump of* [*om.* the stump of[3]]
5 Dagon was left to him. Therefore neither the priests of Dagon, nor any that come
into Dagon's house, tread on the threshold of Dagon unto this day.
6 But [And[4]] the hand of the Lord [Jehovah] was heavy upon them of Ashdod,
and he destroyed them, and smote them with emerods [boils[5]], *even* [*om.* even] Ash-
7 dod and the coasts[6] thereof. And when [*om.* when] the men of Ashdod saw that it
was so, [*ins.* and] they said, The ark of the God of Israel shall not abide with us,
for his hand is sore upon us, and upon Dagon our god. [*ins.* And] they sent there-
8 fore [*om.* therefore] and gathered all the lords of the Philistines unto them, and
said, What shall we do with the ark of the God of Israel? And they answered
[said], Let the ark of the God of Israel be carried about [removed] unto Gath.
And they carried [removed] the ark of the God of Israel about *thither* [*om.* about
9 thither]. And it was *so* [And it came to pass] that, after they had carried it about
[removed it], the hand of the Lord [Jehovah] was against the city with a very great
destruction [; *there was* a very great consternation[7]]; and he smote the men [people]
of the city, both small and great, and they had emerods in their secret parts [and
boils broke out[8] on them]. Therefore [And] they sent the ark of God to Ekron.
10 And it came to pass, as the ark of God came to Ekron, that the Ekronites cried
out, saying, They have brought about [*om.* about] the ark of the God of Israel to
11 us [me[9]], to slay us [me] and our [my] people. So [And] they sent and gathered
together all the lords of the Philistines, and said, Send away the ark of the God of
Israel, and let it go again [return] to his [its] own [*om.* own] place, that it slay us
[me] not, and our [my] people; for there was a deadly destruction [consternation]
12 throughout [in] all the city; the hand of God was very heavy there. And the
men that died not were smitten with the emerods [boils]; and the cry of the city
went up to heaven.

[3] [Ver. 4. It seems better to omit this explanatory phrase, which is not found in the Heb., and to leave the word "Dagon" to be explained in the exposition; for, though the phrase is probably correct (see Erdmann's account of Dagon), it is still an interpretation rather than a translation.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 6. The text of the Sept. here deviates decidedly from the Heb.; for attempts to reconcile the two see Thenius and Wellhausen, *in loco*. There is no good ground, however, for departing from the Heb.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 6. The versions here all follow the Qeri *tehorim*, which word most of them take to mean a part of the body (posteriora), and not a disease. Chald. and Syr. have this very word. Chald. "mariscæ," Syr. "posteriora," Arab. "sedes," Vulg. "in secretiori parte natium," Philippson "schambeulen." Geiger thinks that the Kethib means "posteriora," and the Qeri a disease of that part of the body, the change of reading having been made for decency's sake. This was probably the reason of the change, but the Kethib seems to mean the disease, while the Qeri means both a disease and a part of the body. No explanation has yet been given of the reading of the Sept. "ships" (ναῦς); it may be simply an error of transcription for ἕδρας, which is found in ver. 9.—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 7. The word "coasts," not now used in its original sense of "sides," has here been retained because of the difficulty of finding another equally good rendering of the Heb. word (גְּבוּלִים).—Tr.

[7] [Ver. 9. Erdmann: "*zu grossem schrecken*," but it is better, with the versions, to take it as an independent sentence.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 9. Eng. A. V. takes the verb שתר as—סתר, "concealed," but the connection does not favour this. Gesenius' suggestion "broke out" is adopted by Erdmann, and seems best, but Philippson, from the Arab. root which Gesen. compares, *shatara*, "*ruptus fuit*," prefers "broke," as indicating the culmination of the disease—*aufbrechen* instead of *hervorbrechen*. Philippson's rendering is etymologically better founded, but does not so well suit the connection.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 10. The Sing. here points to the prince or other person who was spokesman for the people.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1-5. *Jehovah's demonstration of power against the Philistine heathenism.*—Vers. 1 sqq. **From Ebenezer to Ashdod.**—On the anticipatory use of the name Ebenezer, with reference to ch. vii. 12, see ch. iv. 1. Ashdod, Ἄζωτος, one of the capital cities of the five Philistine princes (Josh. xiii. 3), named in ch. vi. 17 as that seat of Dagon-worship, which comes first to be considered in the course of this narrative—according to Jos. Ant. V. 1, 22 a border-city of Dan; according to Josh. xv. 46, 47, assigned to the Tribe of Judah (Judah was to receive "from Ekron on and westward all that lay near Ashdod, and their [Ashdod's and Ekron's] villages"), but never really held by the Israelites, though the Philistines were at times subject to the Israelites (Josh. xiii. 3)—a mile from the sea, now the little village Esdud, on an elevation on the road from Jamnia to Gaza, nine miles south of Jamnia, and about thirty-two miles north of Gaza.—Ver. 2. **The house of Dagon** is the temple of one of the *chief Philistine deities*, for which there were places of worship not only in Ashdod, but also, according to Jerome on Isa. xlvi. 1, in the other Philistine cities; but, according to Judg. xvi. 23 sqq., there was certainly a central sanctuary in *Gaza*, where, after the capture of Samson, the princes and the people assembled to hold a sacrifice and feast in honor of Dagon as the supposed bestower of their victory over Samson. Along with the *male* deity, a corresponding *female* deity

was, according to Diodorus, worshipped, called by the Syrians Derceto (=Atargatis). As this idol-image had the face of a woman, and terminated below the waist in the tail of a fish, so the statue of Dagon, which in vers. 3, 4, is expressly represented as male, had a human head and hands, and a *fish-body;* he is thus characterized as a *marine* deity, the symbol of the fruitfulness which is represented in the element of water by the fish, like the Babylonian Ὠδάκων. Comp. Movers, *Religion der Phöniz.* I. 143 sq., 590 sq.; Stark, *Gaza und die philistäische Küste*, Jena, 1852, p. 274 sq. The name is to be derived, not from דָּגָן, "grain" (Philo Bybl. in Eus. *Præp.*, pp. 26, 32, Bochart, *Hieroz.* I. 381, Movers in *Evang.* 1, 10, Sanchon., *fragm. ed. Orelli*, Ersch, *Phöniz.*, p. 405 *b*) with Bunsen, Ewald and Diestel (*Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.*, 1860, p. 726), according to which Dagon was the god of land-fruitfulness, of agriculture, but from *dag* דָּג, "fish" (Winer, *s. v.*). Compare Kimchi's reference to an old tradition: "It is said, that Dagon had the form of a fish from the navel down, and was therefore called Dagon, and the form of a man from the navel up." Comp. J. G. Müller in Herzog, *R.-E.* III. 255 sq. Thenius and Keil recognize this personage in a figure found by Layard at Khorsabad, the upper part of whose body represents a bearded man, adorned with a royal crown, the lower part of the body from the navel on running into the form of a fish bent backwards; that this is a marine deity is beyond doubt, since he is swimming in the sea and surrounded by all sorts of sea-beasts (Layard, *Nineve und seine Ueberreste*, Germ. ed. of Meissner, p. 424 sq. [Nineveh and its remains]).

Keil rightly remarks: "As this relief, according to Layard, represents a battle between the inhabitants of the Syrian coast and an Assyrian king, probably Sargon, who had a hard struggle with the Philistine cities, especially Ashdod, it is scarcely doubtful that we here have a representation of the Philistine Dagon" (*Comm. in loco*).*—The Philistines ascribed their victory over the Israelites to Dagon; therefore they brought the ark as votive offering to his temple, where, by its position near his statue, it was to set forth for the Philistines the subjection of the God of Israel to the power of their "god" (ver. 7).—But the *overthrow* of the image, and its *recumbent position* on its face *before the ark* (—Theodoret: they saw their God showing the form of worship, τῆς προσκυνήσεως ἐπιδεικνῦντα τὸ σχῆμα—), was to be a sign to them that the God of Israel was not the conquered, but that before Him, who had temporarily delivered Israel into the hands of their enemies, every other power must sink into the dust. They set up the statue again under the impression that the cause of the overthrow was an accidental one. But in the following night not only is the prostration of the image at the feet of the ark repeated—it is besides mutilated; the head and the hands are *cut off* (not "broken off"). They did not lie "towards the threshold;" it is true, this is the proper meaning of אֶל, but it also signifies rest, instead of movement, and is ="on," "at;" comp. 1 Sam. xvii. 3; Deut. xvi. 6; 1 Kings viii. 30. From ver. 5 it is clear that the parts cut off lay *on* the threshold, and this was not only destruction, but *contempt*, since what lies on the threshold is exposed to be trodden on, the extremest act of contempt. "*To him*," that is, to the whole represented in the image, was left only the fish-stump, since what was human in him, head and hands, was cut off. Kimchi: "Only the form of a fish was left in him." The "threshold" is without doubt the door-sill of the chamber in which the image stood. Nothing is said directly of a divine miracle. But the matter is so represented by the narrator that we must recognize a special arrangement of the God of Israel for the exhibition of the powerlessness and nothingness of the god of the Philistines.—Ver. 5 gives an account of a ceremonial custom derived from this occurrence: the threshold of Dagon was not trodden on by his priests, *etc.* The "*threshold*" of Dagon, that is, of the place where his statue was set up, is distinguished from the house of Dagon, into which they went. This threshold was considered as made especially holy to Dagon by that occurrence, because his head and hands had lain on it. Sept.: ὑπερβαίνοντες ὑπερβαίνουσι, "they carefully step over it." Comp. Zeph. i. 9. According to this passage and ch. vi. 2, there was a special body of priests for the worship of Dagon. The word *kohen* (כֹּהֵן) is used in the Old Testament also of heathen priests, Gen. xli. 45. The formula "to this day" usually indicates a long time (comp. vi. 18; xxx. 25; xxvii. 6; 2 Sam. iv. 3; vi. 8; xviii. 18), and establishes the remoteness of the narrator from the time of the occurrences described.

Vers. 6-12. *God's chastising manifestation of power against the Philistine people by plagues and sickness.* Ver. 6. **The hand of the Lord is** here figuratively put for God's might and power, as it made itself felt by the Philistines in the infliction of grievous severe sufferings as chastisement for the violation of His honor. The sufferings are viewed partly as an *oppressive burden*, in which God's hand is felt to be *heavy* (comp. v. 11; vi. 5; Ps. xxxii. 4; xxxviii. 2; Job xxiii. 2), partly as a grievous *blow*, in which it is felt to be *hard* (ver. 7, comp. Job ix. 34).—In *two ways* the hand of the Lord was heavy on the inhabitants of Ashdod: 1) it wasted, destroyed them, and 2) it smote them with boils. The one calamity fell on their land (De Wette: wasted their land); the other was a bodily disease which extended over Ashdod and all its district. The Sept. adds to ver. 6: "and mice were produced in the land, and there arose a great and deadly confusion in the city;" but this does not furnish, as Thenius maintains, "the original, though somewhat corrupt, text, which contained this statement;" rather, as a second translation of this ver. 6 has been wrongly inserted at the end of ver. 3 by a copyist of the Greek, so the second part of this addition is taken word for word from ver. 11, and the first had its origin in an explanation (in itself appropriate enough) of vi. 4 sq. For from vi. 4, 5, 11, 18, where, besides the expiatory or votive offering referring to the bodily disease, a second, the golden mice, is expressly mentioned, it is clear that, in addition to the cor-

* [Dagon was probably originally an old Babylonian fish-deity.—Tr.]

poral plague, another, a land-plague, had fallen on the Philistines. Taking into view the passages in ch. vi. the words: "he destroyed them" (like "destruction" [desolation] in Mic. vi. 13, used of persons) denote a wasting of the land, that is, of the produce of the fields, as the support of human life, by mice, "which destroy the land," ch. vi. 5. There is no gap in the Heb. text; but the expression "he destroyed them" is a brief description of the universal land-plague, the nature and cause of which appears from the after mention of the votive and expiatory present brought by the Philistines. "The most prominent characteristic of the field-mouse, especially in southern countries, is its voracity and rapid increase. At times these animals multiply with frightful rapidity and suddenness, ravage the fields far and near, produce famine and pestilential diseases among the inhabitants of the land, and have not seldom forced whole nations to emigrate" (see examples, cited from Strabo, Diodorus, Aelian, Agatharchides, and others, in Bochart, *Hieroz.* III., cap. 34). Sommer, *Bibl. Abhandl.*, p. 263. The ravaging of the land by field-mice probably stood in causal connection with the second plague, the boil-sickness.—**And he smote them with** *ophalim* (עֳפָלִים), which, from the connection, must have been a bodily disease. The points of the word belong to the Qeri *tehorim* (טְחֹרִים), which was substituted for the Kethib (and in ch. vi. 4, 5, has even gotten into the text), because the word, which properly signifies "swelling," "elevation," "hill," was supposed to designate the anus, and in its place *tehorim*, "posteriora," as a more decent expression, was read. It was thence rendered: "He smote them on the anus;" and this view seemed to be supported by Ps. lxxviii. 66, where, in reference to God's judgment on the Philistines after the removal of the ark, it is said: "And he smote his enemies *ahor*" (אָחוֹר), which was taken in the above sense particularly from the following word "reproach;" for ex. Vulg.: "and he smote his enemies in posteriora;" Luther: "in the hinder parts" [so Eng. A. V.]. But this rendering of the Psalm-passage is incorrect; the proper translation is: "And he smote his enemies *back*, and put everlasting reproach on them" (Geiger, Hengstenberg, Hupfeld). The above rendering has occasioned on the part of the expositors the suggestion of various affections of the hinder part of the body; some think of diarrhœa (Ewald), others of tumors, mariscæ, chancres (Keil), others of hemorrhoids [the "emerods" of Eng. A. V.], and the like. But, apart from the fact that no definite local disease of the sort is indicated, the verb (הִכָּה with בְּ), as Thenius conclusively shows, never means "to strike *on* something" (for ex., on a part of the body), but means in this connection "to strike *with* something" (with a disease or plague). According to the radical meaning of the word *ophalim*, we must render: he smote them with a skin-disease, which consisted in painful boils or large swellings, and was perhaps caused by the plague of field-mice, which Oken (cited by Thenius *in loco*) calls "the plague of the *fields*, often producing scarcity, and even famine." This explanation is supported by Deut. xxviii. 27, where the word in question stands along with the names of two skin-diseases, of which one (שְׁחִין) is the Egyptian leprosy-like botch, and the other (גָּרָב and חֶרֶס) "scab and itch." Only by supposing such a plague-like disease, which became infectious on the breaking out of the boils (ver. 9), can we explain its immediate universal spread (indicated by the words "and its coasts"), and its deadly effect (vers. 11, 12; vi. 19), facts not explained by the other suppositions. Comp. Win., *Realw.* II., *s. v.* Philister.—Ver. 7. In consequence of "its being so," under such circumstances (כֵּן here as Gen. xxv. 22), the people of Ashdod *recognized* the fact that the power of the God of Israel was here manifested on them and their god, and *resolved* to get rid of the medium of this manifestation, for so they regarded the ark.—Ver. 8 furnishes a contribution to the history of the political constitution of the Philistines. The *princes* (סְרָנִים, *seranim*) of the Philistines are the heads of the several city-districts (Josh. xiii. 3), which formed a confederation, each one of the five chief cities holding a number of places, "country-cities" (1 Sam. xxvii. 5), "daughter-cities" (1 Chron. xviii. 1), as its special district. The constitution was oligarchical, that is, the government was in the hands of the College of princes, whose decision no individual could oppose, comp. xxix. 6–11. Grotius: "the Phil. were under an oligarchy." The resolve of the princes is: "the ark shall be carried to *Gath*," and is forthwith executed. According to this there was no Dagon-temple in Gath; for the purpose was to remove the ark from the sanctuary of Dagon, who, in their opinion, called forth the power of the God of Israel, without being able to make stand against him. The location of *Gath*, also one of the five princely cities—Gitta (Joseph.), Getha (Sept.), Getha (Euseb.)—is doubtful. In this passage (vers. 8–10) the connection points merely to the fact that it is to be sought for in the neighborhood of Ashdod and Ekron; but it does not thence necessarily follow (Ewald) that it lay between these two. Jerome's statements indicate a location near Ashdod and near the limits of Judea: "Gath is one of the five cities of Palestine, near the border of Judea, on the road from Eleutheropolis to Gaza, and still a very large village (on Micah i.); Gath is near and bordering on Ashdod (on Jer. xxv.)." Comp. Pressel in Herzog, *R. E. s. v.** The Sept. takes Gath as subject, inserts "to us" (אֵלַי or אֵלֵינוּ) after Israel, and translates: "And the Gittites said, Let the ark of God come to us." But this addition is uncalled for. Thenius indeed prefers this reading on the ground that such a *voluntary* offer to receive the ark in order to show that the calamity was merely *accidental*, is completely in accordance with the whole narrative; but, on the other hand, we may conclude from ver. 6 that they regarded

* [Eusebius (*Onom.*) mentions two places called Gath, one between Antipatris and Jamnia (which cannot be the place here meant), the other five miles from Eleutheropolis (identified by Robinson, II. 59 sq., with Beit Jibrin) towards Diospolis. Mr. J. L. Porter, Art. "Gath," in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, accordingly identifies Gath with the hill called Tell-es-Safieh, ten miles east of Ashdod, and about the same distance south by east of Ekron. —Tr.]

as the cause of the evil the relation of the God of Israel to their god Dagon, and the object of the transportation of the ark was to remove it from the region of Dagon-worship.—Ver. 9. The same scourge was repeated in *Gath;* the plague of boils fell upon *all*, small and great. Its painful and dangerous character is here more precisely indicated by the once-occurring word (hapaxleg.) *sathar* (שׂתר) which means, following the corresponding Arabic verb (Niph. *findi, erumpi*), the *bursting* of the plague-boils. The Acc. "great consternation" (מה׳ גד׳), giving a sensible representation of the direction and motion, in which an action reaches a definite aim or end, sets forth the final effect or result in the minds of the Philistines of this new manifestation of God's power; generally, where the point reached is to be indicated, the pref. "to" (לְ) is used (as in chap. iv. 9). "The hand of the Lord was on the city *unto great* consternation."*—Ver. 10 sqq. *Further removal* of the ark to a third princely city, *Ekron*, according to Robinson (*Pal.* III. 229 sq. [Amer. Ed. II. 227 sq.]) three miles east of Jamnia and five miles south of Ramleh on the site of the present village Akir, that is, in a northerly direction from Gath. Comp. Tobler, 3 Wand., 53; Josh. xiii. 3. "Although first assigned to the Tribe of Judah (Josh. xv. 45), and for a time held by it (Judg. i. 18, on which see Bertheau), then made over to Dan (Josh. xix. 43), it could not be retained permanently by the Israelites, but, when the Philistines advanced, fell again into their hands, and continued in their possession (Josh. xv. 11; 1 Sam. vi. 17; vii. 14)." Rüetschi in Herzog *s. v.* In ver. 10 is related how the inhabitants of Ekron, when the ark was brought to them, thinking of the late occurrences, made *complaint* and *protest* against its entrance.—Vers. 11, 12. The failure of their protest is here silently assumed, and the universal prevalence, and particularly the deadly effects of the plague described. There was every where a "deadly consternation," that is, a consternation produced by the sudden death of many persons from the plague, which was connected with the boil-sickness. Observe the *climax* in the *triple* description of the plague; in Gath it is severer than in Ashdod; in Ekron it has reached its greatest height. The words at the end of the description—**And the cry of the city went up to heaven**—assume that the Philistines saw clearly that in this plague the almighty hand of the God of Israel was revealed. A *second* council of princes, it is expressly stated (ver. 11, beginning), was called to consult in reference to *the restoration of the ark to the Israelites.* The proposition of Ekron (as yet undecided on) is indeed based on the deadly effects of the plague on its inhabitants (ver. 11), but at the same time it takes for granted that the removal of the ark to other Philistian places would be attended with the same results, and that the punishment of the God of Israel would of necessity continue so long as the insult offered Him by the abduction of the ark was not done away with. [*Bib. Comm.* compares this scourge in its object and effects with the plagues of Egypt. See Ex. xii. 33, and also Numb. xvii. 12. With the phrase "went up to heaven" Bp. Patrick compares the classical expressions (**Virg.** *Æneid.* II. 223, 338, 488): *Clamores simul horrendos ad sidera tollit; Sublatus ad æthera clamor; Ferit aurea sidera clamor.*—Tr.]

* [But on the reading of this verse see "Textual and Grammatical" note.—Tr.]

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. Though God brings the judgment on His house and people through world-powers without His kingdom and hostile to His name, He yet shows Himself towards these hostile powers a God that judges righteously in the punishment of the evil they do to the honor of His name in their purpose (though it be by His will or His permission) to oppose His kingdom and hinder its coming. The Philistines, by His counsel and will victorious over the children of Israel, had with His permission taken away the sign of His presence with His people, and brought it into the presence of the idol, that Israel might be right sorely humbled and punished; yet they are chastised as having refused to honor Him as the living God, though the manifestation of His might and glory was set before their eyes.

2. The downfall of the idol-image before the ark and the excision of its most important parts (head and hands) is not merely a symbol, but also a type* of the truth which is illustrated in the history of God's kingdom, even in its gloomiest periods, namely, that the powers of the world must sink again into the dust before His glory, after they, in truth taken into His service, have done their work, and that the time appointed by Him comes, when His enemies are made His foot-stool. Comp. the declarations in Ex. ix. 16 and xiv. 18 in reference to Egypt. "Where God comes with His ark and His testimony, there He smites the idols to the ground; idolatry must fall, where His gospel finds a place" (*Berlenb. Bible*).

3. The heavy pressure and the hard blows of the *hand* of God, to which repeated and significant reference is made in connection with the severed hands of the idol-image, was intended not only as a deserved punishment for the Philistines, but also as a *disciplinary visitation.* All suffering is punishment, but also (as a chastisement of God's hand) an instrument of correction; that is, under suffering and affliction, as the outflow and result of sin, man is not merely to recognize the causal connection between His sin and the divine punitory justice on the one hand, and the affliction on the other, but also to have His eyes opened to the purposes of God's holy love, which by adversity and tribulation will draw him to itself, and humble him under God's powerful hand to reverence His name.

* [Dr. Erdmann here uses the word type, not in the scientific theological sense of a fact of the Old Dispensation, which is intended to set forth the corresponding (spiritually identical) fact of the New Dispensation, but in the general sense of a representative or specimen fact. It is a method of the divine providence inferred from the Scripture and illustrated in history, rather than a spiritual fact of God's spiritual kingdom prefigured by an outward object or fact in His ancient people or service. The ark symbolized God's presence in law and mercy, but was not in itself a type, except as a part of the Tabernacle which typified God's people. The lesson from the punishment of the Philistines, then, is the same as that contained in the slaughter at Samson's death, the plagues of Egypt, the destruction of Babylon (Psalm cxxxvii. 8), and other cases in which God has interfered to save His cause; only here the procedure is more dramatically striking.—Tr.]

4. When man's heart *will* not give up its worthless idols, though God's hand draws it to Himself by affliction and suffering, then the distance between Him and the God that offers to be with him becomes greater in proportion to the severity and painfulness of the suffering felt by the soul alienated from God and devoted to idolatry. We shall at last desire to be entirely away from God, as the Philistines at last resolved to carry the ark over the border, that they might have nothing more to do with the God of Israel, while, on the contrary, the ark should have warned them to give glory to the God of Israel, who had so unmistakably and gloriously revealed Himself to them.

5. The cry that ascends *to heaven* over sufferings and afflictions that are the consequences of wickedness is by no means a sign that need teaches prayer; it may be made from a wholly heathen point of view. The cry that penetrates *into heaven* is "*Against thee* have I sinned," and is the expression of an upright, earnest penitence which is awakened in the heart by the chastisement of God's hand.

6. The Philistines do not deride and scorn the sanctuary of the Israelites, but from their standpoint show it reverence and treat it with forbearance and awe; and herein is exemplified the truth that even the enemies of God's kingdom and the opponents of the honor of His name in the affairs of His kingdom stand involuntarily and unconsciously under the influence of His power and glory, and a restraining higher power is near, from which they cannot withdraw. "They cannot advance, whom the Lord's greater power restrains. The supreme controller of affairs so orders all things that the wicked are restrained by fear—though their souls are haughty and they swell with pride and arrogance; and they cannot execute what their minds purpose. For God fetters and holds captive, as it were, their hands, and suffers not His glory to be obscured" (Calvin).

7. Often in the history of His kingdom, amid frightful victories by the hostile powers of the world, God's hand seems bound, and His people fall into the deepest affliction, so that even the most sacred possessions seem to have fallen into the rapacious hands of the world, which is contending against God and His kingdom; yet even then He knows how to maintain His honor inviolate, and His hand is yet free, and (as in the history of this war between Israel and the Philistines) in secret makes the preparation for the liberation and redemption of His people, and the restoration of the sanctuary and the possession of His kingdom, while human eyes do not see it, and human thought does not suspect it. The Lord is *mighty* and *powerful* even in the sorest defeats of His kingdom in the battle with the world. He brings every thing to glorious accomplishment.

8. Calvin: "The Philistines seek hiding-places from God's presence. Let us learn that the same thing happens to all God's enemies when they are given over to a reprobate mind. For though they are under the dominion of the lethargy of sin, yet, when God urges them more closely, and their own conscience presses them, they seek hiding-places against the majesty of God, and would save themselves by flight."

9. [This chapter, with the following, strikingly illustrates the non-missionary character of the Old Dispensation. For centuries the Israelites were near neighbors of the Philistines, and had some acquaintance (apparently not much) with their political and religious institutions. Yet the Philistines had at this time only a garbled and distorted account (iv. 8) of the history of the Israelites, derived probably from tradition, and seemingly no particular knowledge at all of their religion, nor did the Israelites ever attempt, though they were in the times of Samson and David in close connection with Philistia, to carry thither a knowledge of what they yet believed to be the only true religion. This religious isolation was no doubt a part of the divine plan for the development of the theocratic kingdom, guarding it against the taint of idolatry, and permitting the chosen people thoroughly to apprehend and appropriate the truth which was then to go from them to all the world. But if we look for the natural causes which produced this moral isolation in ancient times, we shall find one in the narrowness of ancient civilization, where the absence of means of social and literary communication fostered mutual ignorance and made sympathy almost impossible, and another in the peculiarly national local nature of the religion of Israel, with its central sanctuary and its whole system grounded in the past history of the nation, presenting thus great obstacles to a foreigner who wished to become a worshipper of Jehovah. These might be overcome, as in Naaman's case, but it was not easy to throw off one's nationality (as was necessary for the convert) either at home or by going to live in the land of Israel. All this may palliate the unbelief of the ancient heathen peoples—palliate, but not excuse it, for Jehovah revealed Himself in mighty works which ought to have carried conviction (comp. vi. 6) and led to obedience and love. On the other hand, the Israelite ought to have tried to bring the heathen to the true God, and indeed in the Pss. we find exhortations to them to come and acknowledge Him. But the Jews, as a nation, never freed themselves from the narrowness to which their institutions trained them.—Tr.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[Henry: God will show of how little account the ark of the covenant is, if the covenant itself be broken and neglected; even sacred signs are not things that either He is tied to, or we can trust to.—Tr.]

Vers. 1-5. *The ruinous folly of the idolatrous mind:* 1) It places God beside the idols, as if one could serve two masters (vers. 1, 2; Matt. vi. 24); 2) It does not allow itself to be pointed to the living God by the nothingness of its idols in contrast with Him (ver. 3); 3) In spite of the destruction of its idols through the power of the Lord before its eyes, it always sets up again the old idolatrous service, and carries it still further (ver. 4); 4) Sinking from one degree of superstition to another, it gives itself up, and is given up by God ever deeper and deeper into selfish idolatry.—*Dagon before the ark*, or *Heathenism conquered at the feet of the living God:* 1) In the domain of its power, its *own abode* (vers. 1, 2); 2) Through the *secret demonstration of the power* of the Lord (vers. 3, 4); 3) Amid the *destruction* of its *power and*

glory (the *face* as a sign of its worthless glory and vain beauty struck down to the earth, the *head* also as the seat of the wisdom which is alienated from God and opposed to God, the *hands* as a symbol of the powers of darkness which work therein, cut off) (vers. 3-5).—*The fall of heathenism:* 1) It is *thrown down* before the power of God manifesting Himself as present in His *word* (the law and the testimony in the ark) (vers. 1-3); 2) Its power (head and hands) is *broken* and *destroyed* through the secretly working power of the Spirit of God (vers. 3, 4); 3) There is an ever more and more glorious *revelation* of the power of God which casts down heathenism in the light of the day of salvation, which overcomes the darkness of heathenism.—*The defeat which the kingdom of the world suffers in its victory over the kingdom of God:* 1) In quiet *concealment;* 2) Through the *miraculous* action of God; 3) In open *publicity.*

Vers. 6, 7. Calvin: Here it is clearly shown how great is the stiff-neckedness of unbelievers in their error, that when the manifest signs of the divine judgments press ever nearer, and there is no more room at all for excuses, and when they can no longer conceal their fear of the judgment and the power of God, yet they do not recognize their contumacy, and lay aside their hardness of heart, but only seek hiding-places and places of refuge, in order to withdraw themselves as far as possible from the divine power that it may not reach them. What sort of effect do unbelievers let the experience and apprehension of the infinite power of God produce in them? Not a change of disposition, not a zealous striving after the knowledge of the truth in His word, and willingness to give Him the honor which belongs to Him, not humility of heart in subjection to the majesty of God, but rather fear and terror at His presence, and the striving to fly as far from Him as possible, and to keep God removed as far as possible from them.—God avenges Himself on the enemies of His people, in that, even when they have obtained a victory over the people of God, it yet turns out worse for them than for the people of God who are defeated, Job xx. 5-7.—Cramer: God can even with ease constrain His enemies to confession.

Ver. 8. Starke: Foolish men, to think that the almightiness of God can be thwarted by change of place.—Seb. Schmidt: Against God the devices of men, even the wisest, avail nothing. [Ver. 9. "Boils." There are many other passages in our English version of the Bible in which an apparent indelicacy is due to erroneous translation.—Hall: They judge right of the cause; what do they resolve for the cure? . . . . They should have said: Let us cast out Dagon, that we may pacify and retain the God of Israel; they determine to thrust out the ark of God, that they might peaceably enjoy themselves, and Dagon.—Tr.]

Ver. 10. God has the hearts of all men in His hands (Prov. xxi. 1), and can speedily turn them to change their will and purposes, so as to promote His honor and the best interests of the Church.—Ver. 12. Calvin: We should not imitate the Ekronites, who fill heaven with their cry, but with their heart are far from God; rather should we, when the ark of God comes so near us, come with our heart to God. *To Him* should we cry, when He comes in His judgments, and beg Him for help without complaining, while we confess to Him our sins, and acknowledge that we receive from Him righteous punishment, and that the sufferings which He has inflicted on us are wholesome for us.—Schlier: Then could Israel clearly see what an almighty God they had, stronger than the gods of all the heathens and that this strong God wished to be their God, and had interested Himself in behalf of His people.

---

2. Restoration of the Ark with Expiatory Gifts. Chap. VI. 1–11.

1 And the ark of the Lord [Jehovah] was in the country of the Philistines seven
2 months. And the Philistines called for [together[1]] the priests and the diviners,
saying, What shall we do to [with] the ark of the Lord [Jehovah]? Tell us
3 wherewith[2] we shall send it to his [its] place. And they said, If ye[3] send away the
ark of the God of Israel, send it not empty, but in any wise [*om.* in any wise[4]]
return him[5] a trespass-offering; then ye shall be healed,[6] and it shall be known[7] to

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 2. So the verb is not unfrequently used, as in Josh. xxiii. 2.—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 2. Or, "how.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 3. The Pron. is not in the present Heb. text, but is found in 7 MSS., in Sept., Syr., Chald., Arab., and apparently in Vulg. It may have fallen out, as Houbigant suggests, from similarity to the following word (אתם את). Others (so Erdmann) take the construction as impersonal, and render: "if one sends back," *etc.* —Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 3. This phrase in Eng. A. V. is intended to express the Heb. Inf. Abs.; but where the proper shade of intensity or emphasis cannot be given in Eng., it is better to write the verb simply, and not introduce a foreign substantive idea.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 3. Some ancient vss. and modern expositors refer this to the ark, and render "to it," relying on the grammatical connection, and on ver. 9; but the Philistines throughout seem to regard God, and not the ark, as the author of their sufferings. Yet it is possible that, even with this view, their idolatrous ideas might have led them to appease the instrument or visible occasion of the divine infliction.—Tr.]

4 you why his hand is not removed from you. Then said they [And they said],
What shall be [is] the trespass-offering which we shall return to him? [*Ins.* And]
they answered [said], Five golden emerods [boils] and five golden mice,[8] according[9]
to the number of the lords of the Philistines; for one plague was [is] on you[10] all
5 and on your lords. Wherefore [And] ye shall make images of your emerods
[boils], and images of your mice that mar [devastate] the land; and ye shall give
glory to the God of Israel; peradventure he will lighten his hand from off you,
6 and from off your gods, and from off your land. [*Ins.* And] wherefore then [*om.*
then] do [will] ye harden your hearts, as the Egyptians and Pharaoh hardened
their hearts? [*ins.* Did they not], when he had [*om.* had[11]] wrought wonderfully
among them, did they not [*om.* did they not] let the people go, and they departed?
7 Now therefore [And now] make[12] a new cart, and take[12] two milch kine, on which
there hath come no yoke, and tie [yoke] the kine to the cart, and bring their calves
8 home from them. And take the ark of the Lord [Jehovah], and lay it upon the
cart, and put the jewels of gold [golden figures[13]], which ye return him[5] for a tres-
pass-offering, in a [the[14]] coffer by the side thereof, and send it away, that it may
9 go. And see, if it goeth [go] up by the way of his [its] own coast to Beth-Shemesh,
then he hath done us this great evil; but if not, then we shall know that it is not
10 his hand that smote us; it was a chance that happened to us. And the men did
so, and took two milch kine, and tied [yoked] them to the cart, and shut up their
11 calves at home; And they [*om.* they] laid the ark of the Lord [Jehovah] upon the
cart, and the coffer with [and] the mice of gold [golden mice] and the images of
their emerods [boils].[15]

3. Reception and Quartering of the Ark in Israel. Chap. VI. 12—VII. 1.

12 And the kine took the straight way [went straight forward[16]] to the way of [on
the road to] Bethshemesh, *and* [*om.* and] went along the highway [on one highway
they went], lowing[17] as they went, and turned not aside to the right hand or to the
left; and the lords of the Philistines went after them unto the border of Bethshe-

[6] [Ver. 3. Erdmann and others take this sentence as conditional (which is here possible, but somewhat hard) on the ground that the priests are not sure that the atonement-offering will be successful, but propose an experiment (as in ver. 9). Yet in vers. 5 and 6 they are sure, and the experiment in ver. 9 seems an afterthought.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 3. The Heb. text is here supported by Syr., Arab. and Vulg., nor is there any variation in the MSS. (De Rossi); but Sept. has "expiation shall be made for you" (נִכַּפֵּר), and Chald. "healing shall be granted you" (יִתְרְוּח). To the first of these the repetition is an objection, to the second the order of ideas (healing, expiation). It does not appear whether they are loose renderings of our text, or represent a different text.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 4. Philippson renders "tumors" (*geschwülste*), setting aside the supposed plague of field-mice. See Exeg. Notes *in loco.* The Sept. here departs from the Heb. text in the order of statements and in the number of mice; see the discussion in the note on the passage.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 4. This clause stands first in the original.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 4. Heb.: "them all," and so Erdmann and Philippson. But all the VSS. and 10 MSS. read "you," which the sense seems to require.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 6. The verb (התְעַלֵּל) is Aor., rendered "wrought" in Ex. x. 2 by Eng. A. V.; Sept. and Vulg. render freely "smote;" but Syr. has "they mocked them, and did not send them away, and they went," where the wrong number of the first vb. required the negation in the second.—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 7. Or, "take and prepare" (so Erdmann). But the verb קְחוּ may properly be taken as expletive or pleonastic here, as in 2 Sam. xviii. 18 (see Ges. Lex. s. v.), though it must be understood before the second accusative "kine."—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 8. The word כְּלִי means any instrument or implement, and is used of utensils, implements, armor, weapons, vessels and jewels; here, however, it is none of these, but figures, copies or works: Luther, bilder, Erdmann, geräthe, D'Allioli, figures, Cahen, empreintes, and the other modern VSS., of Martin, Diodati, D'Almeida, De S. Miguel, have "figures;" only the Dutch has "jewels," Vulg. *vasa*, Sept. *σκεύη*.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 8. The Art. here points out the coffer which belonged to the cart; but as this is not otherwise known or mentioned, the insertion or omission of the Art. in Eng. makes little or no difference. The Al. Sept. inserts a neg. before the word "put" in this verse, perhaps to avoid a supposed difficulty in the number of golden mice.—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 11. The Vat. Sept. (but not Al.) omits the words "and the images of their boils," perhaps in order to indicate that the mice were not in the argaz or box, and thus avoid the difficulty above-mentioned (see ver. 18). Wellhausen, taking exception to the inverted order here (mice, boils), to the word *tehorim*, and to the ambiguity of the phrase, omits all of ver. 11 after "coffer," regarding the Heb. as a gloss on the already corrupt Greek. But this is improbable, and the Heb. is sustained by all the VSS. The *tehorim* is not improbably a marginal explanation of *ophalim* which has crept into the text (so Geiger and Erdmann); but the text, though not perfectly clear, must, on critical grounds, be retained, since there would have been no special reason why a scribe should insert it, but on the other hand ground for its omission, as the Greek shows tampering with the text to avoid a difficulty.—Tr.]

[16] [Ver. 12. On the form of the Heb. word see Erdmann in loco.—Tr.]

[17] [Ver. 12. Ges. Gram. (Conant's transl.), § 75, Rem. I. 2.—Tr.]

13 mesh. And they[18] of Bethshemesh were reaping their wheat-harvest in the valley;
14 and they lifted up their eyes, and saw the ark, and rejoiced to see[19] it. And the
cart came into the field of Joshua a Bethshemite [the Bethshemeshite], and stood
there, where [and there] there was a great stone; and they clave the wood of the
15 cart, and offered the kine a burnt-offering unto the Lord [Jehovah]. And the
Levites took down the ark of the Lord [Jehovah], and the coffer that was with it,
wherein [*ins.* were] the jewels of gold [golden figures] were [*om.* were], and put
them on the great stone; and the men of Bethshemesh offered burnt-offerings, and
16 sacrificed sacrifices the same day unto the Lord [Jehovah]. And when [*om.* when]
the five lords of the Philistines had seen [saw] it, they [and] returned to Ekron
17 the same day. And these are the golden emerods [boils] which the Philistines
returned for [as] a trespass-offering unto the Lord [Jehovah]: for Ashdod one, for
18 Gaza one, for Askelon one, for Gath one, for Ekron one. And the golden mice
[*ins.* were] according to the number of all the cities of the Philistines belonging to
the five lords, both of fenced cities and of country villages,[20] even unto the great
stone of Abel whereon they set down the ark of the Lord, *which stone remaineth* unto
this day in the field of Joshua the Bethshemite [And[21] the great stone, on which
they set down the ark of Jehovah, remaineth to this day in the field of Joshua the
Bethshemeshite].
19 And he smote the men of Bethshemesh, because they had [*om.* had] looked into
[at[22]] the ark of the Lord [Jehovah], even [and] he smote of the people fifty thou-
sand and three-score and ten men [70 men, 50,000 men[23]]; and the people lamented,
because the Lord [Jehovah] had smitten [smote] *many of* [*om.* many of] the people
20 with a great slaughter. And the men of Bethshemesh said, Who is able to stand
before [*ins.* Jehovah], this holy Lord [*om.* Lord] God? and to whom shall he go
21 up from us? And they sent messengers to the inhabitants of Kirjath-jearim, say-
ing, The Philistines have brought again [back] the ark of the Lord [Jehovah];
come ye down, *and* fetch it up to you.
CHAP. VII. 1 AND the men of Kirjath-jearim came, and fetched up the ark of the
Lord [Jehovah], and brought it into the house of Abinadab in [on] the hill, and
sanctified [consecrated] Eleazar his son to keep the ark of the Lord [Jehovah].

[18] [Ver. 13. The Heb. has simply "Bethshemesh," the place put for its inhabitants.—TR.]

[19] [Ver. 13. Sept.: "to meet it" (לִקְרָאתוֹ), error of copyist.—TR.]

[20] [Ver. 18. The first clause of this verse (and along with it ver. 17) is stricken out by Wellhausen on the ground of its incompatibility with ver. 8. The external evidence for the clause is complete; on the internal evidence see the Comm. *in loco* and Translator's note.—TR.]

[21] [Ver. 18. Or: "witness is the great stone," *etc.*, omitting the word "remaineth;" so Erdmann, see Comm. *in loco*. The simpler translation given above is that suggested in Bib. Comm.—TR.]

[22] [Ver. 19. This is the common meaning of the verb (ראה with ב).—TR.]

[23] [Ver. 19. These numbers, though probably incorrect, are left in the text, because no satisfactory reading has been settled on. The clause should be bracketed. See discussion in Comm.—TR.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

I. Vers. 1–11. *The ark is sent back with expiatory gifts.* The designation of place: **in the field** is here to be taken in the wider sense of *territory, country*, as in Ruth i. 2.—The **seven months**, during which the ark was in the country of the Philistines, was a time of uninterrupted plagues. In addition to the disease of boils came the plague of the devastation of the fields by *mice*. That the plague of mice was something over and above the disease is plain from vers. 5, 11, 18; in ver. 1 the Sept. adds, "*and their land swarmed with mice*," which the narrator has not expressly mentioned. Thenius' supposition that, from similarity of final syllables ((ים־), a clause has fallen out of the Heb. text, is too bold a one. Maurer remarks correctly: "it is generally agreed that the Hebrew writers not infrequently omit things essential, and then afterwards mention them briefly in succession."—Ver. 2. After it had been determined in the council of the *princes* to send back the ark to the Israelites, the *priests* and *soothsayers* are now to tell *how* it shall be sent back. Alongside of an honorable priestly class appear here the *soothsayers* [diviners] (that is, the organs of the deity, who reveal his counsel and will through the mantic art) as authorities, whose decision is final. The princes had to consider the political-national and social side, these the religious side of the question.* Inasmuch as it has already been deter-

* [The word here employed for "priests" (kohanim) is the same as that used to designate the priests of the true God, the distinctive word for idol-priests (kemarim) occurring only three times in O. T., though frequent in the Syriac and Chald. translations. The Arabic here renders "chiefs" or "doctors" (ahbara), probably to avoid a scandalous application of the sacred name. For etymology of *kohen* see Ges., Thes., and Fürst, Heb. Lex. —The word rendered "soothsayer" (qosem) is probably from a stem meaning "to divide, partition, assign fortunes," and seems to be employed to denote divination by processes such as shaking arrows, consulting teraphim, inspecting livers (Ez. xxi. 26-28 [21-23]), perhaps differing thus from the mantic art proper, which involved possession or inspiration by the deity (which two me-

mined to send the ark back, the question "what shall we do in respect to the ark of God?" is only introductory to the succeeding question, "*wherewith* or *how* shall we send it to its place?" The בַּמֶּה may mean either, but the rendering "how, in what way" (Vulg. *quomodo*) is favored by the connection, since the priests would else not have answered that the ark was not to be sent back without gifts.—Ver. 3. We must here not supply the pronoun "ye" to the Particip. (מְשַׁלְּחִים), but must render (as in ii. 24) impersonally*: "if one sends, if they send." The ark must be restored, not *empty*, but with gifts. These gifts are to be an *asham* (אָשָׁם), a debt-offering or expiatory offering; the gift is thus designated, because it is a question of the payment of a debt.† Satisfaction must be made to the angered God of the people of Israel for the contempt put on Him by the abduction of the ark. The word "return, make compensation" (הֵשִׁיב) refers to the unlawful appropriation; it is a matter of compensation. Vulg.: *quod debetis, reddite ei pro peccato.* לוֹ ["to him," "to it"] is to be referred not to the ark (Sept.), but to God. Send Him a "gift, by which His anger shall be appeased, lest He torment you more" (Cleric.). According to Ex. xxiii. 15 no one was allowed to appear empty-handed (רֵיקָם) before God. Whether, as Clericus supposes, this was known to the Philistine priests, is uncertain. The words אָז תֵּרָפְאוּ may be taken either as *conditional* or as *assertory*. The latter rendering "then you shall be healed" would suit the connection and the whole situation, but that these priests expressly declare it to be possible (ver. 9) that this plague was to be ascribed not to the God of Israel, but to a chance. The hypothetical rendering is therefore to be preferred, which is grammatically allowable, though the conditional particle is wanting. (Comp. Ew. *Gr.*, § 357 *b*). We must therefore translate: "and if ye shall be healed."‡ In the words "and it shall be known to you why His hand *is not removed from you*" the present tense offers no difficulty, the sense being: "you shall then by the cure learn why His hand now smites you; His hand is not removed from you, because the expiation for your guilt, which will be followed by cure, is not yet made."

Bunsen: "It was a universal custom of ancient nations to dedicate to the deity to whom a sickness was ascribed, or from whom cure was desired, likenesses of the diseased parts." This was true also of the cause of the plagues. The Philistines therefore (ver. 4 sq.), when they inquired what they should send along as trespass or expiatory offering, received the answer: "five golden boils and five golden mice." The number five is expressly fixed on with reference to the five princes of the Philistines, who represent the whole people (מִסְפַּר is Acc. of exact determination "according to, in relation to," with adverbial signification. Ges. *Gr.*, § 118, 3). The change of person in the words "one plague is on *them* all and on *your* princes" has occasioned the reading "*you* all," which is for this reason to be rejected.* People and princes are here regarded as a unit, the latter representing the former, and therefore the number of the gifts to be offered for the whole is determined by the number (five) of the princes. Ver. 5 makes in a supplementary way express mention of the *devastation* which the *mice* made in the land. "This plague is often far greater in southern lands than with us; so that the Egyptians use the figure of a fieldmouse to denote destruction; there are many examples, it is said, of the whole harvest in a field having been destroyed by them in one night" (v. Gerl.). Comp. Boch. *Hieroz.* II., 429 ed. Ros.; Plin. *Hist. Nat.* X. c. 65. By the presentation of the likenesses in gold they were to "give honor to the God of Israel." These words of the Philistine priests explain the expression "pay or return a trespass-offering." By the removal of the ark, the seat of the glory of the God of Israel, His honor is violated; hence the punishment in this two-fold plague; by these gifts they are to attempt to make compensation for the violation of honor, and the wrath of the God who is wounded in His honor is to be turned aside. "By bringing precisely the instrument of their chastisement as a gift to God, they confess that He Himself has punished them, and do homage to His might, hoping therefore all the more by paying their debt to be made or to remain free," (v. Gerlach). The expression "*perhaps* He will lighten His hand from off you" agrees with that in ver. 3, "if ye be healed," and with ver. 9.

[It is not clear that the Philistines were visited with a plague of mice. In spite of Maurer's remark (on ver. 1) endorsed by Erdmann, it is strange that no mention is made of the mice in chap. v. Philippson (who translates *akbar* not "mouse" but "boil") further objects that the assumption of a mouse-plague different from the boil-disease is incompatible with the assertion in ver. 4, "one plague is on you and on your lords," which supposes a bodily infliction (on which, however, see the discussion of the Sept. text of vers. 4, 5, in note to ver. 18). Nor does the Heb. text expressly state that there was such a plague. In ver. 5 nothing more is necessarily said (so Wellhausen) than that they were exposed to land devastations by mice, and that the whole land had suffered, and ver. 18 (however interpreted) adds nothing to the statement in ver. 4. We may on critical grounds keep the present Masoretic text (discarding the Sept. addition to ver. 1) without finding in it the mouse-plague. On the other hand, the figure of a mouse was in Egypt a symbol of destruction, and so might have been chosen here as a fitting expia-

thods Cicero calls divination with and without art, Div. I, 18). The word is used in O. T. only of false diviners (for wider use in Arabic see Freytag, Ar. Lex. *s. v. qasama*). Comp. Art. "Divination" in Smith's *Bib. Dict.* Articles "Wahrsager" and "Magier" in Winer's *Bib. R. W.*, and Ges., Thes.—Tr.]

* [On this see Translator's note in "Textual and Grammatical."—Tr.]

† [The word *asham* rather means not "debt," but "offence" and its "punishment" (comp. Gen. xxvi. 10; Ps. xiv. 9; Isa. liii. 10, and the Arab. *athama*), and is not restricted in the Mosaic Law to cases of restitution (see Lev. v. (Eng. A. V. v.—vi. 7), xiv. 12; Nu. vi. 12). Here it may be used in this latter sense, and is in general more appropriate than *hattath*, since the Philistines cannot be supposed to have the deeper conception of sin involved in the latter word. It is, of course, a question whether they employed this very word *asham*.—Tr.]

‡ [Against this see note under "Textual and Grammatical."—Tr.]

* [For defence of the reading "you all" see "Textual and Grammatical" notes *in loco*.—Tr.]

tory offering. Possibly, as there was a Baal-zebub, "lord of flies" (Ζεὺς Ἀπόμυιος), worshipped at Ekron, so there was a Baal-akbar, "lord of mice," and this animal may have been connected with religious worship.—Others explain the figures of the boils and mice as telesms or talismans. So Maimonides, quoted in Poole's Synopsis, in which are cited many illustrations of the wide use of talismans (figures made under planetary and astral conjunctions in the likeness of the injurious object or of the part affected) among the ancients (expanded by Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust., Saul and David*, p. 86 sq.). But, supposing there was a plague of mice, these figures were prepared, not by their own virtue to avert the plague (which the talismans were supposed to do), but to appease the wrath of the God of Israel.—Tr.].—**Lighten from off you**, *etc.*, is a pregnant expression for "lighten and turn away from you," so that the burden of the punishment shall be removed from you. In ver. 6 the case of the *Egyptians* is referred to in order to strengthen the exhortation. We have already seen in iv. 8 the mark of the deep impression made on the neighboring heathen nations by the judgments of the God of Israel on the Egyptians. The Philistine priests see in these plagues judgments like those inflicted on the Egyptians, and set forth the universal and comprehensive significance of this revelation of the heavy hand of God in the words "on [rather *from*] you, and your god [better, perhaps, *gods*, as in Eng. A. V.], and your land." They thus refer this general calamity not only to its highest cause in the God of Israel and His violated honor, but also to its deepest ground in the Philistines' hardening of the heart against Him after the manner of Pharaoh and the Egyptians, and so show exact acquaintance with the pragmatism of the history of God's revelations towards Egypt and its king. Comp. Ex. vii. 13 sqq. with viii. 32. It is evident from the connection that the words of the priests are to be referred only to the obligation to "give honor to the God of Israel" by expiatory presents, not to the restoration of the ark, which was already determined on. The hardening or obduration of the heart is the stubborn and persistent refusal to give to the God of Israel His due honor, after His honor had been violated. The word הִתְעַלֵּל ["wrought"] points to God's mighty deeds against Pharaoh and the Egyptians; it is found in the same sense "work, exercise power" ["work one's will on"] in Ex. x. 2 and 1 Sam. xxxi. 4. In view of these exhibitions of God's power, they are warned against such a persistent stiff-necked opposition to it. Ver. 6 is not inconsistent with the doubt expressed in ver. 9, whether the plagues come from the God of Israel or from a chance, since it is (in ver. 9) at any rate regarded as possible that the God of Israel has thus exhibited His anger. "The mere possibility of this makes it seem advisable to do every thing to appease the wrath of the God of the Israelites, which the heathen, from their fear of the gods, dreaded under the circumstances not less, yea, more than the anger of their own gods" (Keil).

Vers. 7–9. *The arrangements respecting the mode of sending back the ark.* In ver. 7 the *arrangements* are made for a restoration of the ark worthy of and proportionate to the honor of the God of Israel. The Philistines are not, for this purpose, to have *a new cart* made, but, as the preceding קְחוּ shows, to *take** one already made, in order to fit it up and prepare it for this end; this is shown by the וַעֲשׂוּ ["and make"]. A *new* cart and two hitherto *unyoked* milch cows (comp. Deut. xxi. 3) are to carry back the ark with the presents; only what had not been used, what was still undesecrated, was an appropriate means for the honor destined to be shown to the dreaded God of Israel. עֲגָלָה, properly the "rolling thing," means the transport-wagon, which, according to this, was in use in Philistia, and was usually yoked with oxen. The calves were to be taken along, but afterwards to be carried from behind the drawing cows, back into the house—that is, into the stall. In reference to the cows the Masc. is thrice used in ver. 7 for the Fem., "because the writer thinks of the cows as *oxen*" (Thenius); and so in vers. 10, 12. In ver. 8 a minute description is given of the manner of loading the cart with the ark and with the coffer (אַרְגַּז, found only here and vers. 11, 15) in which the golden expiatory gifts were to be carried. "*And send it away, that it may go.*" From the connection it appears that the cart, with the ark, is left to the cows to draw; the direction which they take without being led or driven is decisive of the question whether the plagues are from the God of Israel or not.

Ver. 9. This is stated more precisely by the priests. If the cows went straight to *its* (the ark's) territory, this would be the sign that the plagues were from the God of Israel; if not, it would show that it was only a matter of chance. From their stand-point the heathen distinguished with perfect logical consistency between the providence of the God of Israel and a mere chance. "Its territory or coast" (גְּבוּלוֹ) is the land of Israel as its home. *Bethshemesh* is one of the Israelitish priestly cities on the border of Judah and Dan (Josh. xxi. 16), the nearest of them to Ekron, and the nearest point of entrance from Philistia into the hill-country of Judah (Josh. xv. 10, 11). The valley in or on which (ver. 13) it lay, was the same with the present Wady Surar. The present Ain Shems which rests on it is the ancient Bethshemesh.† S. Robinson, II. 599, III. 224 sq. [Amer. Ed. II. 14, 16, 223–225.] If this direction was not taken by the cows, that was to be the sign that "*this was a chance* (מִקְרֶה is not adverb. "by

* [Erdmann translates: "take and make a new cart, and take two milch cows,"—on which see note under "Textual and Grammatical."—Tr.]

† [Robinson: "Just on the west of the village (Ain Shems), on and around the plateau of a low swell between the Surar on the North and a smaller Wady on the South, are the manifest traces of an ancient site. Here are the vestiges of a former extensive city, consisting of many foundations and the remains of ancient walls of hewn stone. The materials have indeed been chiefly swallowed up in the probably repeated constructions of the modern village; but enough yet remains to make it one of the largest and most marked sites which we had any where seen. On the north the great Wady es-Surar—itself a plain—runs off first west and then north-west into the great plain; while on the south the smaller Wady comes down from the south-east, and uniting with the one down which we had traveled, they enter the Surar below the ruins."—Tr.]

chance" (Keil), but Nom. of the subject; and this is no ground for reading (with Böttcher) מִקְרָה, "by chance"). The meaning of the priests was, that the cows, being unaccustomed to the yoke, and being, besides, milch cows, from which their calves had been separated, would, in obedience to their natural impulse, wish to turn about and go back to their stall, unless a higher power restrained them, and compelled them to take the road to Bethshemesh and keep it. By God's ordination this was done, and so was for the Philistines the factual confirmation given by the God of Israel of the opinion that He had inflicted the plagues on them. Vers. 10, 11 relate the carrying out of the arrangements which the priests had made. The restoration is performed in the manner prescribed by the priests.

II. Vers. 12–21. *The ark is transported to Bethshemesh.* Ver. 12. They kept the road exactly—lit. "they were straight on the way."* *Mesillah* (מְסִלָּה) is a thrown up, raised way, a highway. *On one highway*—that is, without going hither and thither, as is afterwards added by way of explanation, "without turning aside to the right or to the left." *They went going and lowing;* that is, constantly lowing, because they wanted their calves; yet they did not turn about, but went on in the opposite direction. The Philistine princes went *behind, not before* them, because, in accordance with the suggestion of the priests, they had to observe whither the animals went. Ver. 13. *Bethshemesh* is for "the inhabitants of Bethshemesh." Though it was a priestly city, the inhabitants of Bethshemesh are expressly distinguished from the Levites. The Bethshemeshites, who were reaping wheat in the valley (Wady Surar), rejoiced to see the long-lost ark. [The wheat harvest points to May or June as the time of the return of the ark. Robinson: "May 13. Most of the fields (near Jericho) were already reaped. Three days before we had left the wheat green upon the fields around Hebron and Carmel; and we afterwards found the harvest there in a less forward state on the 6th of June" (I. 550, 551). We do not know what species of wheat the ancient Hebrews had; but the crop was the most important one in the country (see 1 Kings v. 11). Mr. W. Houghton says (Smith's *Bib. Dict.* Art. "Wheat"): "There appear to be two or three kinds of wheat at present grown in Palestine, the *Triticum vulgare* (var. *hybernum*), the *T. spelta*, and another variety of bearded wheat, which appears to be the same as the Egyptian kind, the *T. compositum.*" The phrase "they lifted up their eyes and saw," being the common Heb. formula for "looking," does not show that the object looked at was on a higher elevation than the spectator. Thus Stanley's argument (*Sin. and Pal.*, p. 248) from Gen. xxii. 4 as to the site of "Moriah" has no weight.—Tr.] Ver. 14. *The great stone* in the field of the Bethshemeshite Joshua was probably the occasion of the cart's being stopped here, with the design of using the stone as a sacred spot for the solemn removal of the ark and the presents, as appears from ver. 15. *The Levites* are expressly mentioned in connection with the setting the ark down on the great stone, a sacred act which pertained to them alone. Since the ark betokened the presence of the Lord, it could be said that they, namely, the Bethshemeshites, offered the kine to *the Lord* by using the wood of the cart for the burnt-offering. With this they joined a blood-offering. It was lawful to offer the sacrifice here, because, wherever the ark was, offering might be made. Though *the people of Bethshemesh* are expressly said to be the offerers [ver. 15], this does not exclude the co-operation of the priests, especially as Bethshemesh was a priestly city. From the *single* burnt-offering in ver. 14, which was offered with the cart and the kine, the burnt-offerings [ver. 15] and the slain-offerings, which were connected with a joyful sacrificial meal, are to be distinguished as a second sacrificial act, which, in its first element (the burnt-offering), set forth the renewed consecration and devotion of the whole life to the Lord, and in its second (the meal) expressed joyful thanksgiving for the restoration of God's enthronement and habitation amid His people, of which they had been so long deprived. Ver. 16. The five lords of the Philistines saw in this occurrence, in accordance with the instruction of their priests, a revelation of the God of Israel; they returned to Ekron the same day.—Vers. 17, 18. A second enumeration of the expiatory gifts, comp. ver. 4. The statement here made varies from that of ver. 4 only in the fact, that, while the priests had advised the presentation of only five golden figures of mice, here a much greater number, "*according to the number of all the cities of the Philistines,*" are offered; because, from the expression "*from the fenced city to the village of the inhabitants of the low land*" (הַפְּרָזִי, Deut. iii. 5) [rather "fenced cities and country* villages"], which shows that every Philistine locality was represented in the mouse-figures, we learn that the mouse-plague extended over the whole country, while the boil-plague prevailed only in the largest cities.† In the second clause, instead of וְעַד ["and unto"] read וְעֵד ["and witness"], and instead of אָבֵל ["Abel"], we must, on account of the attached Adj. and the repeated reference to the "field of Joshua" (vers. 14, 16), read אֶבֶן ["stone"], and translate: "*and a witness is the great stone* (וְעֵד is found in the same sense, Gen. xxxi. 52) . . . *to this day.*" Kimchi's explanation of אָבֵל as the name [the Heb. word means "mourning"] given to the stone on account of the mourning made there

* יְשַׁרְנָה is for יִישַׁרְנָה, and the ׳ for ת. On this form comp. Ew. § 191 *b*, and Gesen. § 47, R. 3.

* [The word פְּרָזָה is explained by the Mishna and the Jews generally, and by Gesenius, to mean "open country," and this signification for the adj. form in the text is required by the contrast with "*fenced* cities." See Ges. *Thes. s. v.* The Arab. stem *pharaza* is "to separate"—and the derived nouns have the sense of "planeness," whence the rural districts may have been called "plane," that is, "unwalled."—Tr.]

† [On the supposition that there was no mouse-plague, the mouse-figures equally represented the whole country. In this connection the Greek text of vers. 4, 5 is worthy of attention. It reads: "(ver. 4), five golden hedras (*ophalim*, 'boils'), according to the number of the lords of the Philistines; (ver. 5), and golden mice, like the mice," *etc.;* thus separating the two statements, and omitting the second number five. If this reading were adopted, it would relieve the Heb. text, which, in several places in this chapter, shows traces of corruption. See note under "Textual and Grammatical."—Tr.]

(ver. 19) is a fanciful expedient, which has also no support in the context, since nothing is afterwards said of a mourning at this stone.

Vers. 19–21. *The ark in Bethshemesh.* A *punishment* is inflicted by God on the Bethshemeshites because they had sinned respecting the *holiness* of God, which was represented before their eyes by the ark. Wherein this sin consisted is stated in the words "because they looked," &c. (כִּי רָאוּ בְּ), which are to be connected with the question in ver. 20. From ver. 13 (if we retain the text) it could not have been the mere looking at the ark, which stood on the cart, and was necessarily visible to every body, but, as the בְּ shows, consisted only in the manner of looking at it. As the unauthorized *touching* (Num. iv. 15; 2 Sam. vi. 7), so the profane, prying, curious *looking at* the ark, as the symbol of the holy God who dwells amid His people, is forbidden on pain of death. The fundamental passage, to which we must here go back, is Num. iv. 20. The deepest ground of the strict prohibition to touch and look at the ark lies in the opposition which exists between man, impure through sin, and the holy God, which cannot be removed by immediate and unmediated connection with God on man's part, but only through the means which God has by special revelation ordained to this end. Against Thenius, who holds that this explanation cannot be based on Num. iv. 20, it is to be remarked that this passage speaks expressly not only of unauthorized *intrusion*, but also of a similar *looking at* the inner sanctuary. There is no contradiction between this verse and ver. 13, if we regard the Acc. in the latter, and the Prep. "at" (בְּ) here; this difference in the designation of the object indicates a difference in *this* connection in the seeing. In Num. iv. 20 also the seeing is more exactly defined by an added word. Other explanations, as: "because they were *afraid* at the ark" (Syr., Arab.), or: "looked *into* it" (Rabb.), are entirely untenable. It is true, however, that the words of the text (according to which the above would be the only tenable explanation) present great difficulties, which Thenius expresses in the remark: "One does not see why 'and he smote' (וַיַּךְ) is repeated, and why we have 'the people' (בָּעָם) again after 'the men of Bethshemesh' (בְּאַנְשֵׁי ב׳)." Moreover, the following words of this verse, which give the number of the slain, undoubtedly offer an incorrect, or rather a corrupt text; whereby the preceding words would be involved in the corruption. The supposition of a defective text being here so natural, we should be inclined to adopt (with Thenius) the reading of the Sept.: "*And the children of Jechoniah* among the Bethshemeshites *were not glad* (chap. v. 13) that they saw the ark, and he smote of them," *etc.*; but that the objection "that we elsewhere find nothing at all about the race of Jechoniah" is by no means so unimportant as Thenius thinks it. The reading "70 men, 50,000 men" is evidently corrupt. If a process of addition were here intended, then "and" (ו) must necessarily stand before the second number. If a partition were meant (70 out of 50,000 men), then, besides the grammatical difficulty, there is the objection that the city of Bethshemesh (and it alone is here spoken of), could not possibly have had so many inhabitants. The last objection applies with still more force to Ewald's translation, "beginning with 70 and increasing to 50,000 men,"—which would require us to suppose a still larger population. The words "50,000 men" are wanting in Jos. (*Ant.* 6, 1–14), and in some Heb. MSS. (Cod. Kenn. 84, 210, 418), and are [to be rejected],* since they give no sense, and probably "came from the *margin* into the text as *another* solution of the numeral sign which stood there (in the original text stood ע [70], while in another נ [50,000] was found)" (Thenius).—The ground of the sudden death of the 70 of the race of Jechoniah is their unsympathizing, and therefore unholy bearing towards the symbol of God's presence among His people, which showed a mind wholly estranged from the living God, a symptom of the religious-moral degeneracy, which had spread among the people, though piety was still to be found.†

Ver. 20. *Who can stand before this holy God?*—This question expresses their consciousness of unworthiness, and their fear of the violated majesty of the covenant-God of Israel. The people of Bethshemesh recognize in the death of the 70 a judgment of God, in which He punishes the violation of His majesty and glory, and defends His holiness in relation to His people. God is called the *holy* in this connection, in that He guards and avenges His greatness and glory, which He had revealed to Israel, when they are violated and dishonored by human sin, by unholy, godless conduct.—From the connection only "*God*" can be the Subj. of "shall go up" (יַעֲלֶה). The question "*to whom shall he go up from us?*"

* [The words in brackets are not in the German—omitted probably by typographical error.—Tr.]

† [On the criticism of this verse see De Rossi, *Var. Lect.*, and a good note in *Bib. Comm.* As to the numbers, it seems impossible to determine anything with certainty, and the conjecture of Thenius (that we read 70, omitting the 50,000) is as probable as any other. That the first part of the verse is corrupt is evident from the variations in the VSS. and the confused character of the Heb. text itself. Two hints for the reconstruction of the true text appear to be given us, one by the Chald., the other by the Sept. The former reads: "and He slew among the men of Bethshemesh, because they *rejoiced* when they saw the ark," *etc.* (where the "rejoiced" is apparently taken from ver. 13); the latter reads: "and not *pleased* were the sons of Jechoniah among the men of Bethshemesh, that they saw the ark," *etc.* Combining these, we may perhaps infer 1) that the "rejoice" or "pleased" was inserted by a translator or copyist, and 2) that a phrase of several words preceded the words "with the men of Bethshemesh." The verse then, may have begun somewhat so: וַיִּחַר אַף יהוה בְּאַנְשֵׁי ב׳, and read "and Jehovah was angry with the Bethshemeshites, because, *etc.*, . . . and smote among them" (reading בהם for בעם). From this the present Heb. text might have come by substituting וַיַּךְ (by homœoteleuton or otherwise) for the first words, and omitting ״ or יהוה, and the Sept. text might be explained as a duplet, in which the בְּנֵי יְכָנְיָהוּ is a corruption of the Heb., and the "displeased" taken from the same source as the Chald.—Wellhausen translates the Sept. into Heb. by the words וְלֹא נִקּוּ בְּנֵי יְכָנְיָהוּ, and adopts this as the true text. But this is not in itself very satisfactory ("and the sons of Jechoniah were not guiltless," *etc.*), and does not answer the demands of the VSS. and the context.—Tr.]

refers then indeed to the ark, in connection with which the sin and the punishment had occurred, and supposes that the Bethshemeshites were unwilling to keep it among them, from fear of farther judgments which its stay might occasion. A superstitious idea here mingles with the fear of God, since the stay of the ark is regarded as in itself a cause of further misfortune.

Ver. 21. *Kirjath-jearim*, that is, "city of forests" [Forestville, Woodville], in the tribe-territory of Judah, belonged at an earlier period to Gibeon (Josh. ix. 17; xviii. 25, 26; Ezra ii. 25; Neh. vii. 29), and is the present Kuryet el Enab= "city of wine" [literally "grapes"] (Rob. II. 588 sq. [Amer. ed. II. 11], and *Bibl. Forschung.* 205 sq. [Am. ed. III. 157], Tobler, *Topogr.* II. 742 sqq.).* The *embassy* to the inhabitants of Kirjath-jearim had two objects: the announcement of the return of the ark, and the demand that they should take it. They are silent as to the misfortune which was connected with its restoration, and as to their reason for not wishing to keep it. Ch. vii. 1 mentions *the safe transportation of the ark by the Kirjath-jearimites to their city*. The ark is placed in the house of *Abinadab* בַּגִּבְעָה, "on the hill," not in "Gibeah" (Vulg., Luther), as if the latter were a suburb of Kirjath-jearim. The house of Abinadab was on a *hill*, and for this reason probably was chosen as the resting-place of the ark. "*They consecrated Eleazar*," the son of Abinadab, that is, they chose and appointed him as a person consecrated to God for this service: he had to *keep watch* and *guard* over the ark. It is hence probable that the ark found shelter in the house of a *Levite*. "Nothing is said of Eleazar's consecration as *priest*. . . . . He was constituted not priest, but watchman at the grave of the ark, by its corpse, till its future joyful resurrection" (Hengst., *Beitr.* III. 66 [Contributions to Int. to O. T.]). Why it was not carried back to *Shiloh*, is uncertain. The reason *may* be, that the Philistines after the victory in ch. iv. had conquered Shiloh, and now held it, as Ewald (*Gesch.* II. 540 [*Hist. of Isr.*]) supposes; though his conjecture that the Philistines had destroyed Shiloh together with the old sanctuary, is to be rejected, since it is certain that the Tabernacle afterwards moved from Shiloh to *Nob*, and thence to *Gibeon*, and that the worship in connection with it was maintained (1 Sam. xxi. 6; 1 Kings iii. 4; 2 Chron. i. 3). Or, it may be that, without a special revelation of the divine will, they were unwilling to carry the ark back to the place whence it had been removed by a judgment of God in consequence of the profanation of the Sanctuary by the sons of Eli (Keil); or simply that the purpose was first and provisionally to carry it safely to a large city as far off as possible, inasmuch as, in view of the sentence of rejection which had been passed on Shiloh, they did not dare to select on their own authority a new place for the Sanctuary (comp. Hengst., *ubi sup.*, 49). It was not till David's time that the ark was carried hence to Jerusalem (2 Sam. vi.).

* [Mr. Grove (Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, Art. "Kirjath-jearim") suggests that the ancient sanctity of Kirjath-jearim (it was called Baalah and Kirjath-Baal, and may have been a seat of worship of the Canaanitish deity Baal) was the ground of the ark's being sent thither. He points out also a difficulty in its identification with Kuryet el Enab from the distance (ten miles over an uneven country) between it and Bethshemesh (Ain Shems), and further from the absence (so far as known) of a hill corresponding to that mentioned in vii. 1. But see Porter, p. 270.—Tr.]

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. *Outside* the sphere of His revelations in the covenant-people, the living God has not allowed the *heathen nations* to be without positive testimonies to His glory; He has, by severe chastisements, made them feel His might and power over them, when they, though they were the instruments of His punitive justice on Israel, did violence to His honor, and transgressed the limits assigned them.

2. The exact knowledge that the Philistine priests and soothsayers had of the punitive revelations of God against the Egyptians, and of the cause of them in the fact that that people hardened itself against Him, is an eminent example of His government of the world, which was closely interwoven with the history of revelation in His kingdom, and in which He penetrated with the beams of His revealed light the darkness of heathenism which surrounded His people, and made preparation for the revelation of the new covenant, which was to embrace the whole world. They were in such light to seek the Lord in their ways, if haply they might feel after Him and find Him (Acts xvii. 27).

3. The *need* of *expiation*, as well as the *demand* for it, is deeply grounded in the relation of man to the holy God; through sin against God's will and ordinances man finds himself in custody under His punitive justice, whence there is no redemption except by an expiation, failing which judgment is pronounced against him. All need of expiation and all means thereto, not only in the sphere of Old Testament revelation, but also in heathendom, are predictions of Christ, who made the universal and all-sufficient expiation for the guilt of the world.

4. The enemies of God's kingdom cannot and are not permitted to retain the possessions of God's sanctuary which they have gotten by robbery, but must bow beneath His mighty hand, and give them up, yea, restore them increased by counter-gifts on their part.

5. "Who can stand before the Lord, this holy God?" The more clearly God's holiness is seen in the mirror of His justice, the deeper and more energetic is the feeling of sin and unworthiness in the human heart before the holy God. The depth of the divine holiness becomes clearest and most sensible to sinful man in *those* of its manifestations, by which he sees God as "*this* holy God," that is, in the vigorous exercise of His holiness, of which he has experience in God's punitive justice directed against himself. But the deeper and more thorough the knowledge of one's own sin, the clearer the knowledge of the divine holiness. Yet, to sinful men the light of the divine holiness, which is always for him *dulled*, must not become *intolerable*, so that he shall avoid God's face, and abandon fellowship with Him; rather must sinful man *bear* this light which discloses all his sin and alienation from God, and seek to learn in it the ways of grace and salvation (Ps. li. 5, 6 [4, 5]). The contrary result of the revelation of God's holiness and justice leads to a sundering of relations

between sinful man and Him, which by man's fault makes of no effect God's purposes of salvation.

6. "The blow which fell on the inhabitants of Bethshemesh in connection with the arrival of the ark, showed the people that they were not yet worthy of the fulfilment of the promise 'I dwell in your midst.' A condition of things had come about like that in the wilderness after the calf-worship, and in the Babylonian exile. The people must first become again inwardly God's people before the sanctuary could be again placed among them. In what had happened they saw God's factual declaration that He wished to dwell no longer in Shiloh" (Hengst. *Beitr.* 3, 48 sq. [*Contrib. to Introd.*]).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1. [HENRY: Seven months Israel was punished with the *absence* of the ark, and the Philistines punished with its *presence*. . . . A melancholy time no doubt it was to the pious in Israel—particularly to Samuel—but they had this to comfort themselves with, as we have in the like distress, when we are deprived of the comfort of public ordinances, that, wherever the ark is, *the Lord is in His holy temple, the Lord's throne is in heaven*, and by faith and prayer we may have access with boldness to Him there. We may have God nigh unto us, when the ark is at a distance.—TR.]. S. SCHMID: God cannot bear with His enemies too long, but knows how at the right time to save His honor.—Vers. 2, 3. J. LANGE: Bad men, when they are chastised for their sins, are commonly disposed not to recognize the true cause, but maintain that it all comes only from chance or from merely natural causes.—WUERTEMBERG BIBLE: Even false prophets and teachers often have the gift of prophecy: Num. xxiv. 2; John xi. 50, 51; Matt. vii. 22, 23. We must therefore not trust to outward gifts.—TUEBINGEN BIBLE: Even the heathen have recognized that the justice of God must be appeased if sin is to be forgiven. —Ver. 6. CRAMER: God is wonderful, and often even speaks His word through unbelievers and ungodly men (Num. xxii. 28). The word of God loses nothing in certainty, power, and worth, though it is preached by ungodly men (Phil. i. 15). [HALL: Samuel himself could not have spoken more divinely than these priests of Dagon: they do not only talk of giving glory to the God of Israel, but fall into an holy and grave expostulation. . . . All religions have afforded them that could speak well. These good words left them both Philistines and superstitious.—TR.].—Ver. 7. S. SCHMID: That the irrational brutes are under God's providence and control, even the heathen have recognized.

Ver. 9. STARKE: Great and wonderful is the long suffering of God, that He condescends to the weakness of men and suffers Himself to be tempted by them.—S. SCHMID: That in which men prescribe to God and tempt Him, cannot indeed bind God; but it binds the men themselves in their consciences, who prescribe to Him.

Ver. 13. S. SCHMID: Even in troublous times God does not cease to do good to His people.—CRAMER: When God brings forth again the light of His word, it ought to be recognized with the highest thankfulness.—Ver. 14. SEB. SCHMID: It is a great favor when God comes forward before men, and voluntarily appears among them.—Ver. 15. WUERT. BIBLE: When, after we have borne trouble and need, God again manifests to us His favor and help, we should not forget to be thankful. —Ver. 19. SEB. SCHMID: An untimely and venturesome joy God can soon turn into great sorrow. —The plague is fortunate that brings the impenitent to repentance.—Ver. 20. BERLENB. BIBLE: When God so to speak only passes by us, through some temporary taste of His presence, it is a favor which He may also impart to sinners. But that He may make His abode in us, as He promises in so many passages of Holy Scripture, that He may be willing to remain with us and in us,—for that there is demanded great purity in every respect.—S. SCHMID: Better is quite too great a fear of God than no fear, if only it does not wholly take away confidence in God's mercy (Ps. cxix. 120).

SECOND SECTION.

The Reformation of Israel by Samuel.

CHAP. VII. 2–17.

I. *Israel's Repentance and Conversion by Means of Samuel's Prophetical Labors.* Vers. 2–6.

2 AND it came to pass, while the ark abode in Kirjathjearim, that the time was
long; for it was twenty years. [And it came to pass, after the day when the ark
rested in K., a long time, even twenty years, elapsed], and all the house of Israel
3 lamented after the Lord [Jehovah]; And[1] Samuel spake unto all the house of Israel,
saying, If ye do return unto the Lord [Jehovah] with all your hearts, *then* put away

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 3. Erdmann makes the whole of ver. 2 protasis, and begins the apodosis with ver. 3, in which the result is not materially different from the translation given above, where the apodosis is made to begin with "a long time," so as to preserve as far as possible the peculiar Heb. connection by the conjunction "and."—TR.]

the strange gods [*ins.* from among you] and [*ins.* the] Ashtaroth[2] from among you
[*om.* from among you], and prepare [direct[3]] your hearts unto the Lord [Jehovah],
and serve him only; and he will deliver you out of the hands of the Philistines.
4 Then the children of Israel did put away [*ins.* the] Baalim and [*ins.* the] Ashtaroth,
5 and served the Lord [Jehovah] only. And Samuel said, Gather all Israel to Miz-
6 peh [Mizpah], and I will pray for you unto the Lord [Jehovah]. And they ga-
thered together to Mizpeh [Mizpah], and drew water, and poured it out before the
Lord [Jehovah], and said there,[4] We have sinned against the Lord [Jehovah]. And
Samuel judged the children of Israel in Mizpeh [Mizpah].

[2] [Ver. 3. Syr. "fanes."—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 3. The Heb. word (הָכִין) means "fix," "establish."—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 6. Syr. "because," as if the Heb. were אֲשֶׁר, which gives in some respects a preferable sense, but it is not externally supported.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 2–4. *The penitential return of the people from idolatry to the sole service of the living God.* First, as to the *union* and *connection* of these sentences, their close union is so distinctly marked by the five-times occurring *Waw* ["and"] that to suppose (with Thenius) a gap between vers. 2 and 3 is unwarranted. And also the connection of the individual statements is opposed to such a view. In ver. 2 the phrase "after or from the day" [מִיּוֹם, Eng. A. V. "while"] marks a *terminus a quo*, on which follows the statement of a *period of time*, of a *condition of things* which lasted during* this period, and of a definite *fact* which introduced a new era. The *point of time*, from which reckoning is made, is the day when the ark rested at Kirjathjearim, important enough, after its long absence, to form the beginning of a new development. The following *period* of twenty years is characterized as disproportionally long by the added words "and the days grew *many*." [The sentence reads literally: "and it came to pass, from the resting of the ark in K., and the days were many, and they were twenty years"]. This is done to set forth more distinctly the *condition* of the people during this period, after the restoration of the ark. The condition of "all the people of Israel" is described by the words וַיִּנָּהוּ, *etc.* [Eng. A. V. "lamented, *etc.*"] according to the inner side of their life in relation to God. The meaning assigned to this verb (וַיִּנָּהוּ) by Gesenius and others, "assembled," rests merely on Buxturf's "*congregati sunt*" (*Lex. Chald.*, p. 1310), which is here and elsewhere an utterly incorrect translation of the Chald. Reflexive. Böttcher (*Æhrenlese* I., p. 111) translates: "the people of Israel *quieted* themselves, and (in quiet devotion) followed Jahveh," and sees in this the contrast to the "great disquietude" mentioned in ch. vi. 19 sq. But, in the first place, against this view is the phrase "after Jehovah," which, in this translation, requires the arbitrary insertion of another verb "and followed," without which insertion the expression "and quieted themselves *after* Jehovah" gives no sense. Further, the reference to vi. 19 sq. is irrelevant, because there it is only a local "disquietude" that is spoken of, not one that touched all the people. Rather, according to Böttcher's own remark—that נחה, in the first place, expresses remarkable breathing in general, heavy respiration, with sighing and lamentation, and hence נָהָה is used of wailing—we must accept as well-grounded the translation: "And sighed or lamented after the Lord." (So נָהָה is used in Mic. ii. 4; Ez. xxxii. 18).* The *matter* or the *cause* of the *lamentation* is determined by the connection between these words and the following, and by the external condition of Israel during this period. In respect to the latter, Böttcher asks: "Why should the Israelites still mourn after twenty years of immunity and quiet? And how could they have lamented 'after Jahveh,' unless it was that their sanctuary had to move again?" To which we reply by pointing to the *uninterrupted oppression* of the Philistine domination; for, though the Philistines had brought the ark humbly back (Then.), there is no conflict between this and ver. 3 "He will save you from the hand of the Philistines," since according to the narrative, the restoration of the ark had a definite religious ground, and noways involved the abandonment of the dominion which had been gained anew over Israel by the victory recorded in chap. iv. Indeed, it is expressly assumed in ver. 3 that this dominion had continued. It is, therefore, incorrect to suppose that the Israelites could have had cause and occasion for lamentation only by a new loss of the ark. Their external condition

* [Or we may just as well understand the repentance to have occurred at the *end* of the period, the intermediate time representing Samuel's labors in exhortation, the result of which was the repentance and conversion of the people.—Tr.]

* [The word נהה is variously treated by the ancient versions and commentators. The Greek renders ἐπέβλεψε "looked to" (perhaps a loose rendering, or possibly they read נבט [Schleusner]), and ἐπέστρεψε "turned to" (general rendering, or perhaps from נחה), the Syr. has *shedo* "inclined to," and the Arab. *aqbala* "approached," both of which resemble the second Greek rendering. (It may be noted that Heb. נָהַג, the Niph. of which would mean "were led" "turned," is also used in the sense of "lamenting," Nah. ii. 8). The Lat. "*requievit*" and the Lat. transl. of Targ. "*quieti fuerunt*" (so Böttcher) suggest the stem נוח. As to the Chald. rendering (נְהוֹ) Böttcher's remark (quoted and accepted by Thenius and Erdmann), that Buxtorf's translation "assembled" is without foundation, seems somewhat rash, for the Ithp. of this verb is employed in Jer. iii. 17 to render Niph. of קוה, and elsewhere (Jer. xxx. 21; xxxi. 22) is to be so rendered. (Levy, Chald., Lex.). Rashi explains the Heb. נהה as = משך "to draw," and so explains the Chald., but Abarbanel renders the former "lament." It would seem therefore that the word was read sometimes with ה, sometimes with ח, and that there was a strong disposition to render it by "assembled" (so Philippson and Davies); yet altogether it appears better to say with Maurer "*prior significatio* (lament) *certior est.*"—Tr.]

under the weight of the Philistine rule was cause enough for sighing and lamenting.

The tone and content of the lamentation is more precisely stated by the *context*. The succeeding address of Samuel (ver. 3) "if ye return" (properly, "if ye are returning," "are in a state of conversion") and the mention of the sincere penitence of the people (ver. 6), presuppose a very deep sorrow and suffering, in which the foreign Philistine rule was felt to be a judgment of God, there being throughout the whole people a tone of feeling, which led them to return humbly to God, and to sigh and long after Him, now that He had turned away from His people: a return back to the living God, on whom they had often turned their back,* to whom, however, they now, in consequence of His continuing judgments, again turned, just as, in the period of the Judges, return so often alternated with apostasy. The "lamenting after the Lord" therefore expresses the penitent disposition and decided direction of the innermost life of the people to their God, in which, with sorrow and pain over the self-incurred national misfortune under the rule of the Philistines, they seek God's mercy and saving help, He having *hitherto turned His back* on them, and forsaken them. The image is that of a child that goes weeping after its father or mother, that it may be relieved of what hurts it. An allusion to such a relation might perhaps be found in the expression "the whole *house* of Israel." S. Schmid: "The phrase 'lament after God' is taken from human affairs, when one follows another, and entreats him with lamentations till he assents. An example of this is the Syrophenician woman, Matt. xv."—After the lapse of the twenty years occurred this decided return of the whole people to their God. As, besides the constant pressure of the Philistine rule, no special calamity is mentioned, we must suppose a gradual preparation for this penitential temper of the people, which now, after the lapse of twenty years from the return of the ark, was become universal. The preparation came from within. By what *means?* by the prophetic labors of Samuel, from the summary description of which, according to their intensive power, their extensive manifestation, and their results in the whole nation (iii. 19-21), we may clearly see, that Samuel without ceasing proclaimed to the people the word of God. And as in ch. iii. 19 it is said that "*none of his words fell to the ground*," we shall have to recognize this penitential temper and this following after God with sighing and lamentation from the consciousness of being forsaken and needing help, as a fruit of Samuel's prophetic labors, which were directed to the relation of the innermost life of the people to their God. So by his influence the way was secretly and gradually paved for a reformation of the religious-moral life from within outwards. Certainly the lamentation of the people after the Lord was already the *turning-point* to a better God-ward direction of the inner life (against Keil); the important thing was only that the people should maintain this following *after God*, should anew devote themselves in heart *firmly* and *decidedly* to the living God, and should give an outward confirmation of their resolution by completely breaking with idolatry. *This* it is to which Samuel will yet further lead the people; *on this* it depended whether the help of the Lord should be obtained, and the true covenant-relation restored; *in this* was first thoroughly completed the reformation of the innermost life of the people; therefore the narrator describes this in detail in ver. 3 sqq., while he sets forth that preparation for the reformation only in its last stage of development, and even then merely by hints.

In ver. 3 Samuel's *word of exhortation* is in the first place described as addressed to the *whole* people (comp. iii. 20); we see him here in the performance of his prophetical work, which embraces all Israel. The *content* of this word is first a conditionally expressed *preliminary:* "If ye return to the Lord with all your hearts." *Two* things are here assumed and recognized as facts: 1) That a *conversion* to God had already taken place in the whole nation, and 2) that this conversion was a *permanent condition*, and that a permanent tendency towards God existed, as we may see from the Particip. "if ye are turning." He thus points back to what is said before of Israel's sighing and lamenting *after the Lord*. The phrase "*with all the heart*" involves an exhortation to what must be inseparably connected with conversion, if the latter is to be true and thorough, demands, that is, an internalizing and deepening of what is described in ver. 2 as lamenting after the Lord, in order that the right *attitude of soul* towards God may exist. Since the heart* is the centre and source of all movements of the inner life, as the bodily heart is the centre of the bloodflow and the life thereon founded, to turn "with all the heart" is so to turn one's self to God, from the central innermost kernel of the personal life, that is, of all thinking, feeling, desiring, willing, that the whole life shall be controlled by the fellowship with Him. To this deeply and thoroughly heart-felt turning, conversion of the whole inner life to the holy God, must now correspond the *external confirmation* of such a disposition. The *demand* is in conformity with the *condition:* "*Put away the strange gods from among you*," which is exactly the same with the demand that Jacob (Gen. xxxv. 2) once made of his house, and Joshua (Josh. xxiv. 23, comp. ch. xiv.) of his people. "After the return of the ark an earnest longing after the Lord arose among Israel. Samuel, availing himself of this, exhorted them to remove all idolatry from their midst" (Hengst., *Beitr.* [*Contrib.*] I. 153 sqq.). The strange gods here spoken of, and called Ashtaroth and Baalim† (comp. ver. 4) are the gods of the Philistines, whose worship had gained entrance during the decline of the theocratic life and of the worship

* [Germ.: *rückkehr zu . . . Gott, dem man . . . den rücken gekehrt hatte.*—Tr.]

* [In the Old Test. (as in the New) the word "heart" (לֵב) means not merely the seat or faculty of feeling, but the whole spiritual incorporeal nature, thinking, feeling, willing.—Tr.]

† [Baalim and Ashtaroth are the plurals of Baal and Ashtoreth (the plu. form signifying different deities of the name, or gods in general, or statues of the gods), ancient deities of Babylon and Assyria, and thence adopted by the Canaanitish nations. Baal, Bil, Bel, is "lord" or supreme deity. Ashtoreth, Astarte, Istar, was the goddess of war, and probably also the Assyrian Venus; the origin of the name is uncertain (it is *not* ἀστήρ). See Rawlinson, "*Ancient Monarchies*," I. 138, Schrader, "*Die Keilinschriften u. das A. T.*," p. 79 sq., Bunsen, "*Egypt's Place in Univ. Hist.*," Eng. Tr., IV. 349 sq.—Tr.]

of the living God, as indeed during the whole Period of the Judges the idol-worship of the heathen nations was constantly forcing its way in, wherefore the Lord gave them again and again into the hand of the latter (Judg. ii. 11, 13; x. 6, 7). The fellowship with the living God, to which conversion with all the heart leads, is incompatible with idol-worship, the putting away of which is therefore the sign of an upright and thorough conversion. As to the "from among you," comp. Gen. xxxv. 2; Josh. xxiv. 23.—To this *negative* side of the renovation of the religious life is to be added the *positive*, which is stated in the following *two-fold* demand. "*Fix your hearts* towards or in trust *in God*." The *fix* (וְהָכִינוּ) is *opposed* to the wavering, vacillating state of mind, which may always co-exist with sighing and lamenting, and sets forth, as an indispensable condition, the energy of religious-moral life, with which the man who turns heartily to God must put away everything opposed to God. The "to Jehovah" expresses the fact that movement and tendency towards God must be the aim, as it is the centre and source, of the whole inner life. In this tendency and movement it is required that there be stability, fixedness, steadfastness, proceeding from a heart which is immovably and unshakably fixed on Him alone. Thereby is the second requirement fulfilled: *serve Him only;* for the heart fixed firmly on Him excludes completely everything, consecration to which might bring it into opposition with God, and cause the surrender of the whole inner life; it attaches itself to God alone, and excludes all other gods.—The following words "and He will deliver you," *etc.*, suppose that the hand, that is, the might and power, of the Philistines was on Israel, and that the foreign rule continued; they contain the promise of deliverance from the Philistine power, holding it out as the consequence of the previously described conversion. The foundation-thought here is this: Re-establish your covenant-relation to God by honest and thorough conversion, manifested by the putting away of all idol-deities, and then God also will turn to you, so that you shall no longer have to lament after Him, and will again announce His relation to you as your covenant-God by saving you from your enemies.—Ver. 4 witnesses that, in these circumstances also, no word of Samuel fell to the ground. *Two* things are stated: the complete removal of the worship of the strange gods, and the restoration of the exclusive worship of the living God. On the one hand, the designation of the strange gods is here enlarged (see ver. 3) by the addition of Baalim to Ashtaroth; it is thus intimated that there was a *complete and comprehensive* purification of the religious life and service. On the other hand, the word "only" is repeated from ver. 3, and it is thus expressly said, that the covenant-God alone and exclusively became the object of worship, while it is at the same time involved that the general service of Jehovah had not ceased, but that the worship of strange gods had existed only *along with* Jehovah-worship.

According to the preceding explanation of the section, vers. 2-4, its particular parts stand in close connection with one another, and there is nothing at all which compels us to suppose either a gap in the narrative, or interpolations of foreign matter, in order to make a connection. The second supposition is adopted by Ewald, who conjectures that vers. 3 and 4 are interpolated, assuming without ground that they break the connection; the first is adopted by Thenius, who assumes a gap between ver. 2 and ver. 3, of which he himself, however, says, that it is possibly as old as our Book, since it is not filled up by any of the old translations. Since, now, he throws the alleged defect back on the original authorities which are here used, the question is, whether his grounds for its existence are tenable, apart from the fact that the context and the narrative exhibit no gap in any essential point. When the Philistines brought back the ark, their dominion over Israel, as Keil properly remarks, was not thereby given up; its continuance is assumed in the words "He will save you," and did not need to be expressly mentioned. As little need was there for express mention of an apostasy to idolatry, when it is stated that Samuel exhorted them to give it up; for in this period, as in that of the Judges, it was a usual thing for idolatry to make its way into Israel, and besides, there had been no complete apostasy from the living God. On the incorrect presupposition that, in consequence of the unmentioned apostasy, Israel had again been given into the hand of the Philistines, Thenius supposes that Samuel, in this time of stress, had been chosen Judge, and that the account of this choice, which, however, is implied in the words: "And Samuel judged Israel in Mizpah," has fallen out. Against which Keil remarks well: "The appearance of Samuel as Shophet [Judge] does not imply that the assumption of this office must have been before mentioned. In general there was no formal assumption of the office of Judge, least of all in the case of Samuel, who had already been recognized by all Israel as an authenticated prophet of Jehovah (iii. 19 sqq.)." Bunsen: "There is *no* gap here, but a *chronological statement.*"

Vers. 5, 6. *The day of penitence and prayer in Mispah* exhibits the whole people there assembled as sincerely *penitent*, and *Samuel* as their *representative* with his *petition* in the presence of the Lord. The content of these verses is the *carrying on* further of what is related in vers. 3-5. After idolatry has been expelled, and the worship of God alone restored, Samuel takes another step forward: he calls at Mizpah an assembly of the whole people, through their elders and representatives, for an exclusively religious purpose; they are to declare and set forth as a body the sincere, hearty conversion of their individual members, while he, Samuel, as their head chosen by God, will perform the priestly function of prayer for them before the Lord. "His purpose in this," as Keil well remarks, "could be only to bring the people back to the proper relation to their God, and so to pave the way for their deliverance from the bondage of the Philistines." This assembly was, however, by no means intended, as Keil supposes, to make immediate preparation for the war of deliverance against the Philistines. That the people did not regard the assembly as a military one, and that Samuel therefore had not spoken of such a one, is clear from ver. 7, where it is said, that the children of

Israel were *afraid* of the Philistines, when they heard that their lords had marched forth to fight with them. The Philistines, indeed, thought the assembly a military one, and opened hostilities in the opinion that the assembly was called to make an attack on them, so that Samuel was compelled to consecrate the people to battle against the Philistines, though they had been called together for a purely religious end (ver. 8 sq.), and to go out with them to battle against the Philistines. The place of assembly is *Mizpah* ("watch-tower") in the Tribe of Benjamin on its western border, north of Jerusalem, and to be distinguished from Mizpeh in the lowland of Judah (Josh. xv. 38). According to Robinson, Tobler, v. d. Velde, Furrer, it is the present *Neby Samwil* ("Prophet Samuel"), five hundred feet above the elevated table-land, two thousand, four hundred and eighty-four feet above the level of the sea, near Ramah and Geba (comp. 1 Kings xv. 22; 2 Chron. xvi. 6), visible from Jerusalem, 1 Mac. iii. 46 (κατέναντι Ἰερουσαλήμ, "over against Jerusalem," comp. Jos. *Ant.* XI. 8, 5), affording an extensive prospect as far as the sea and the transjordanic mountains. The present place is, however, neither the ancient Shiloh, as some hold, nor Ramah of Samuel, as others suppose. The latter view, which Ewald also (*Gesch.* II. 583) is inclined to maintain, has been completely set aside by Robinson (II. 356–362 [Amer. ed. I. 458–460]).* Samuel chose this place for the assembly of the people, not, as Keil supposes, because, "being on the western border of the mountains, it was the fittest place at which to begin the struggle against the Philistines," but because it was one of the holy places of the land, and, being in the middle of the territory on an extensive plateau, and thus protected against the attacks of enemies, was specially suited for such assemblies. While Shiloh, from Joshua's time on, was the permanent seat of the Sanctuary, the Tabernacle remaining there, even after the removal of the ark, till its transference to Nob (xxi. 6), there were, especially in the central part of the land, several other places, "which, for various reasons, from before or after the time of Moses, had a certain sanctity, and where smaller altars were found" (Ew. II. 583); thus, *Shechem* (Josh. xxiv. 25, 26), famous from the Patriarchal time on account of its conquest by Simeon and Levi, and as the resting-place of Joseph's bones (Gen. xxxiv.; xlvii. 1)—*Gilgal*, sacred as the first camping-place of the people after the passage of the Jordan, as the memorial-spot of God's saving help, and as the place where the old covenant-fellowship with God was renewed by the circumcision and passover which were anew ordained by Joshua (Josh. v. 2–12—especially 15), and *Bethel*, consecrated as a holy place by Jacob, and temporarily the seat of the ark during the civil war between Benjamin and the other tribes (Judg. xx. 18, 23, 26; xxi. 2). At that time *Mizpah*—which also was one of the holy places (Judg. xi. 11)—was the place where Israel assembled "unto the Lord" (Judg. xx. 1), to save the honor of the people against the outrage of the inhabitants of Gibeah, and resolved on the war against Benjamin. In this place, consecrated to the worship of God, called therefore in 1 Macc. iii. 46 an ancient τόπος προσευχῆς ["place of prayer"] for Israel, remarkable by its historical antecedents (Judg. xx. 21), and favorably situated in the middle of the land, Samuel appointed an assembly of the people. "In the wearisome oppression of a trying time the people gathered at last, like frightened chickens around the hen, with more and more accord about Samuel, in whom they learned to trust; he calls an assembly of the people, which willingly allows itself to be guided, instructed, warned and directed by him" (Ew. II. 510).—The words "and I will pray," *etc.*, exhibit the *highest end* which Samuel had in calling this assembly: "I will pray *for you* to God." That is, his purpose is to bring the people back to their God and renew the old covenant-fellowship with him by the *intercession of prayer*, by a priestly representation of the people before God by prayer and intercession. The object of the prayer is not mentioned, but, from the connection, can have been nothing else than the manifestation of the divine grace and mercy in the forgiveness of sins and the blotting out of the guilt of sin. Thenius: "For your sins up to this time, that they may be forgiven you." That deliverance from the hand of the Philistines was not, at least not immediately, the object of the intercession, is clear not only from the phrase "for you" (בַּעַדְכֶם), since otherwise Samuel must have used another expression, so as to include himself, but also from the following words, which can be referred only to the deep consciousness of sin and of guilt which was awakened in the people.—In ver. 6 the symbolic act of *drawing* and *pouring out* water does not set forth the confirmation of an oath, as some have supposed: "as the poured out water cannot be gathered again, so our word shall not be taken back"—for this signification of the act must in that case have been somehow intimated in the narrative; nor does it appear from the context that an oath, and what sort of a one, was to be confirmed. The water, *drawn* and poured out, can no more indicate simply *tears*, as Grotius and others think. Others, again, referring to chap. i. 15, explain it of *prayer* (Clericus: "to pour out the heart before God, *i. e.*, to pray to Him from the heart, and open the heart to Him"); but they overlook the fact that then it would have been necessary to annex a preciser statement of *this* meaning to the symbolic use of *water*. Nor can the pouring out of water be regarded as signifying purification from sin, or as the sign of their hope

* [Stanley (*Sin. and Pal.*, Ch. IV.) identifies Neby Samwil with the "high place of Gibeon" (1 Kings iii. 4), and Mizpah with Scopus, which, he says, meets all the requirements of the notices of Mizpah, "the assemblies held there by Samuel—the fortification of it by Asa with the stones removed from 'the Mount' of Benjamin (1 Kings xi. 22)—the seat of the Chaldean governor after the capture of Jerusalem (Jer. xl. 6)—the wailing place of the Maccabees (1 Mac. iii. 46)." Mr. Grove (Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, Art. Mizpah) also adopts this view, laying stress on the κατέναντι of 1 Mac. iii. 46, for which, he thinks, Mizpah is too far from Jerusalem (five miles). Scopus is described by Josephus (B. J. 2, 19, 4) as on the north quarter of the city, seven stadia therefrom, and is now generally held to be "the broad ridge which forms the continuation of the Mount of Olives to the north and east [west?], from which the traveler gains his first view of the Holy City." This view seems probable. Dr. Hackett, however, remarks, in a note to Mr. Grove's Art., that Neby Samwil "is so marked a feature of the landscape, that it may very justly be said to confront (κατέναντι) the observer as he looks towards it from Jerusalem."—Tr.]

that their sins were now blotted out (so O. v. Gerlach), since the water is not here designated at all as a means of purification, and there is no mention of an act of purification. It is rather a *symbolical act of penitence* that is here described. Water, which is poured out and disappears, is a frequent image of the state of dissolution and melting away which characterizes human life, especially on its *inner* side, and is used sometimes of particular aspects of life, sometimes of the whole personality. It is thus used to set forth *moral* dissoluteness and ethical godlessness in Gen. xlix. 4;* comp. Jude ver. 13. It further denotes the destruction, the perishing of all the happiness and prosperity of the *physical* life, Ps. lviii. 8; 2 Sam. xiv. 14; and often also the complete dissolution and breaking up of the *psychical-spiritual* life in fear and spiritlessness, Josh. vii. 5, in care, anxiety, deep misery, Ps. xxii. 15. The latter application of the image is the one here employed, and (since it is the *act* of pouring out water "before the Lord" that is described) in the sense that the people make confession and present themselves before the Lord in deepest consciousness of their wretchedness and in sadness for their sin and the misery that flowed from it. Comp. Lam. ii. 19.—That we have to regard the action as symbol of the heart and the whole inner life poured out "before the Lord,"—that is, completely carried away and dissolved by the feeling of guilt and consequent misery,—is clear from what follows. The *fasting* which was performed the same day is the sign of the repentant, humble soul, bowed down before God, the expression of grief in sincere penitence, designated in the Law as "afflicting the soul" (עִנָּה נֶפֶשׁ), and ordained, as symbol of the humiliation of the whole people in repentance and penitence, for the festival of the great Day of Atonement, Lev. xvi. 29, 31; xxiii. 27, 32; Num. xxix. 7. The word צוֹם ["fast"], which denotes the *form* of "wearying and chastening the soul," is not found in the Law, comp. Isa. lviii. 3 sqq. The bodily deprivation which the man imposes on himself expresses his prostration and humiliation of soul. To the twofold confession of sin and guilt, thus set forth in the symbolical act of pouring out water and fasting, answers, as indication of the contrition thus expressed, the verbal confession: "*We have sinned against the Lord.*" The "*there*" (שָׁם) is not to be understood of *time*, to which it never refers, but of the place, Mizpah. The person *against* whom the sin is committed is here introduced by the Prep. לְ ["to," "against,"] as in chap. ii. 25. While the two symbolical *acts* set forth their state of grief and suffering on account of the disturbance through sin of their relation to God, and their consequent misery, these *words* point not only to sin as the source and object of this prostrate and humbled feeling, but also to the proper *essence* of sin as opposition to the holy will of God as Lawgiver and Judge of His people. It is a grand and touching self-presentation of the whole people before their God in true, thorough penitence and conversion, which is here (vers. 3–6) portrayed in its separate features. Samuel's position in this picture exhibits him in his prophetic work, which takes deep hold on the whole people, and brings them back to the Lord; his words to the people, here reported, form the culmination of all preceding announcements of God's word, and complete the work of the conversion of the people to the Lord, with which he had as faithful prophet hitherto occupied himself. The people, who repent before the Lord in this powerfully moving way, are the fruit of his previous *prophetic* work. **And Samuel judged the children of Israel in Mizpah.**—These words cannot, with Keil, be considered as embracing the whole work just before narrated; that is, as showing that *Samuel's judging* consisted in "Samuel's calling the people together to Mizpah for humiliation before Jehovah, effecting there by his intercession the forgiveness of their sins, bringing back the divine favor, and so restoring Israel's true relation to their God." All this belongs to Samuel's work as Prophet of Israel, comp. iv. 1. Since the statement "Samuel judged Israel in Mizpah" follows immediately on the narration of the solemn act of repentance instituted by Samuel, and afterwards (ver. 15) his judicial work is again mentioned in connection with all that precedes, we must here understand by this "judging" something else than those labors in connection with the religious relation of the people to their God. After Samuel had restored this last by his prophetic work, his succeeding labors were those not only of a prophet, but also of a *judge*. His judicial office is here named for the first time. The connection in which it occurs shows how it proceeded from and was founded on his prophetic office. It is not, however, the beginning or origin of this office that is here mentioned, as if the Verb (שָׁפַט) meant "he *became* judge," but Samuel is here set before us in the *exercise* of his judicial position. It is too narrow a view of this to restrict it to judicial decisions proper, or (as Thenius does) to the punishment of individuals (R. David: "he punished every one according to his offence"). We must rather regard Samuel's judging as a directing and ordering, in accordance with the above act of repentance, of the inner affairs of the people, who were by that religious act inwardly again purified. It consisted both in the administration of right and justice according to the law of the Lord, and in government proper, in the wise carrying out of measures that looked to the good of the people. In their history hitherto the deliverance of the people from the power of their enemies belonged also to the judicial office; with the Judges this, as a judicial function, generally came first, and then followed the direction of internal affairs. With Samuel it was the reverse. The deliverance of the people from the dominion of the Philistines began under his rule as Judge, after he had, as Prophet, brought them back into their right relation to God, and ordered and purified them in their inner life.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The course of true penitence and conversion consists in *mourning* after God, in a sorrowful seeking after Him, in a complete *devotion of the heart* to the Lord, which attests itself by a decided breaking with the power of evil, in energetic *putting away of everything opposed to God*, and in hum-

* [In Gen. xlix. 4 the image is the boiling up of water—denoting rash and heedless passion.—Tr.]

ble *subordination of the will* to the sole authority of the Lord (vers. 2–4).

2. After the ark had lost its significance as theocratic centre of the national life, and Shiloh had ceased to be the central seat of the national sanctuary, after, too, the priesthood, with the rejection of the sanctuary, had lost its prominent middle place between God and the people, then the prophetic office, in the person of Samuel filled with the Spirit of the Lord, took this position, in order to restore the true covenant-relation between God and the people. For this it was necessary that *Israel*, confessing and repenting of their sin against the Lord, should return in sincere penitence to their God, and put away the abomination of heathendom, which they had taken to them, that *God* should turn again to His people with grace and mercy, and that *the whole national life* should assume a completely new form in a righteous disposition and walk, whereby God's holy will would be performed. The point of time to which we have now come is the great turning-point between the Period of the Judges which was just ending and the new era of the theocracy which was just beginning, when Samuel in a *threefold point of view* forms the centre of the people, and in his mediating position between them and their covenant-God, becomes the instrument and founder of a new life: 1) as *Prophet*, in the power of God's Spirit, by which he was filled, he announces to the people the word of the law, in order to lead them to repentance and conversion, and to a life again devoted to the Lord in faithfulness and believing obedience; 2) he appears in the exercise of the *priestly* function, *praying* and *sacrificing*, between God and the people, in order to turn His grace and mercy to the people, that the return of God to His people in the manifestation of His help may correspond to the return of the people to God; 3) as *Judge*, he governs and directs the whole national life, which was inwardly united and bound fast together on the basis of a religious-moral elevation and renewal, in order that they might be consecrated to the Lord in all their members and in all the affairs of life, and serve Him in right and righteousness.—"Samuel's *judicial* work not only proceeded from the *prophetical*, but was constantly guided by it. For we may presume not only that he gave legal decisions with prophetical wisdom, but also that in general he conducted the affairs of the people as a man who had the Spirit of the Lord.—Samuel showed himself here (vii. 12 sq.) a hero by the spiritual power of faith and prayer (Heb. xi. 32 sqq.). This latter may be called an inreaching of his *priestly* work into the judicial. For certainly it is especially the business of the priest to pray for the people." (Nägelsbach, Herz. *R.-E.* XIII. 397.)

3. The *reality* of a thorough *conversion* to the Lord with *all the heart* must be shown by an earnest and decided breaking with everything that is opposed to God, especially with everything to which the heart clings as its idol. The heart *must* not desire to be divided between the *service of idols* and the *service of God*, and *cannot* be divided between two mutually exclusive powers. "No one can serve two masters," Matt. vi. 24. God the Master lays claim to the whole heart; He requires that its service be given to *Him alone and exclusively* in the obedience of faith. *Exclusiveness* in respect to the living God, who claims all honor exclusively for Himself, is of the essence of revealed religion; and in this exclusiveness is grounded its *universality*, everything must serve and be subject to Him alone.

4. The true *welfare* of a *people's life* is based on its proper attitude towards the living God. As defection from Him brings calamity and destruction on all the inward and outward possessions of the national life, infringement or suppression of freedom by foreign power, disruption of unity by strife and discord, so only by return to Him can true inward freedom and elevation and true unity be secured. And, when the national life, in consequence of defection from God, is covered with moral abominations, purification from the defilement of sin must proceed from the innermost life by the complete and thorough conversion of the hearts of individuals to the Lord. Sanctification, purification, unification of the whole *national life* to a life consecrated to God, serving Him alone, happy under His rule in His kingdom, exists only so far as the individual life has its root in the right attitude of heart towards God, and there stands firm and immovable.

5. The *fixed* heart ("*fixing* [Eng. A. V. 'preparing'] the heart unto the Lord") is, on the one hand, the *attestation* of the conversion and purification of the inner life, and, on the other hand, the *condition*, on which alone the whole life can remain permanently and exclusively in the Lord's service, temptations to defection from Him be victoriously withstood, and idolatry in the lust of the eyes, the lust of the flesh and the pride of life be thoroughly put away. The exhortation "confirm, prepare your hearts," does not exclude, but presupposes the truth "it is good that the heart be *confirmed by grace*" [Heb. xiii. 9].

6. Samuel's *intercession* for the whole people was a *priestly* act, whereby he, with the same right as Moses, who also was not officially a priest, could come into God's presence as representative of the people. "He, too, who by His personal dignity stands near to God, the *Prophet*, may thus approach with intercession and expiatory acts for his people. So Moses, Ex. xxxii. 10 sq., 32; Nu. xiv. 12 sqq. (Lev. viii. 15, 19, 28). But it pertains to the *office* of the priesthood, and may be done by them, therefore, in the whole body of their official acts." (Schultz, *Alttest. Theol.*, 189 sq.).

7. The confession "We have sinned against the Lord," made by the whole people, presupposes the correct knowledge of the *essence* of sin as the transgression of His holy will, involves the admission that they were *worthy of punishment* before the Lord, to whom man is bound by his sin as a debtor, and is the *condition* of *help and salvation* from the living God. As the *individual* can regain his proper relation to the Lord only by such humble, sincere, penitent confession, so for the people *in general* there is no other way out of grievous sin-wrought corruption and self-incurred misery to a new national life in the fear of God but this way of a common abasement before the Lord, with reflection on their relation to the holy God, and the penitent confession "*Against thee* have I sinned." Comp. Ps. li. 6 [4].

8. *Fasting* is one of those outward things which are an expression and therefore a symbol of the sorrowful spirit and humble disposition before the

Lord, like rending the garments, strewing ashes on the head, and putting on a coarse garment (comp. Joel ii. 12, 13). Later this religious-morally significant fasting was expressed by a word (צום) which indicated its form, namely, bodily privation; but in the Law itself we find only a phrase which expresses its significance, namely, "afflict the soul" (Lev. xvi. 24, 31; xxiii. 27, 32; Nu. xxix. 7; comp. Isa. lviii. 3 sq.; Ps. xxxv. 13 sq.).—*Legal* provision for fasting by the whole people was made only in the single case of the Day of Atonement, when they were as a body thus to manifest the penitent, humble disposition, without which they could not hope for forgiveness of their sin, Lev. xvi. 29. *Elsewhere* fasting is merely *allowed* by Moses.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 3. Osiander: Those who wish to be shielded against misfortune or delivered from it, must begin, not with weapons of warfare, but with true repentance, Jer. iii. 12.—Cramer: True repentance is the best reformation in religious matters, Ezra ix. 6 sq.; x. 1 sq.—Halle Bib.: Conversion that is not with all the heart, is only a hateful hypocrisy, Deut. iv. 29.—S. Schmid: Only that is a true conversion which does away with all ungodliness, and especially with idolatry, and thus prepares the heart to serve God alone, Hos. vii. 16.—[Hall: How happily effectual is a word spoken in season! Samuel's exhortation wrought upon the hearts of Israel, and fetched water out of their eyes, confessions and vows out of their lips, and their false gods out of their hands.—Tr.]

[Ver. 4. "And served Jehovah only." It is a mournfully common thing among those who have knowledge of the true God to be striving to combine His service with that of idols, or of the world. Not only is it seen here, but in Elijah's exhortation: Either Jehovah or Baal, whichever is God, but not first one and then the other (1 Kings xviii. 21); in our Lord's great word: "No man can serve two masters. . . . . . Ye cannot serve God and Mammon" (Matt. vi. 24); and in that of the last surviving apostle: "Love not the world. . . . . If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him" (1 John ii. 15). Yet how many of us to-day are endeavoring, perhaps with painful earnestness, to love both the Father and the world, to serve both God and Mammon. The many cases of this sort do far more weaken our current Christianity than the few cases of gross vice.—Tr.]

Vers. 5, 6. [Henry: Ministers should pray for those to whom they preach, that God by His grace would make the preaching effectual. And when we come together in religious assemblies, we must remember that it is as much our business there to join in public prayers, as it is to hear a sermon.—Tr.]—Starke: No intercession, not even that of Christ Himself, can stand a man in stead, if he is not truly penitent.—Legislatures and Congresses, if any thing good is to be done in them, should be opened with penitence and prayer.—S. Schmid: Then especially is it proper to pray for our neighbor, when he is so conducting himself as to afford hope that, according to the divine plan, the prayer may be heard.—If candid confession of sin is wanting, the repentance is not honest.

Ver. 2. *The blessing of national mourning in a time of universal distress:* 1) Penitent recognition of the *national sin* which has occasioned the distress; 2) Painful experience of the mighty *hand of the Lord* which has inflicted it; 3) Sorrowful, penitent *seeking after the Lord's consolation and help,* which ends in finding.

Ver. 3. *Samuel's sermon on repentance to Israel when again seeking the Lord's face:* 1) *The instruction* as to what true repentance is (if ye *return with all your hearts*); 2) *The demand* for that by which this repentance shall be really and fruitfully shown: (*a*) put away the strange gods from among you, *b*) direct your hearts unto the Lord, and serve Him only); 3) *The promise* of deliverance and help (and He will deliver you).

Ver. 4. *Proofs of genuine and hearty repentance by actions:* 1) By *doing away* with all idolatry of worldly life; 2) By *serving the Lord only* in a life exclusively consecrated to him.

Ver. 5. *Intercession to the Lord for the salvation of others:* 1) Its *exercise unlimited,* the individual as well as the whole people being its subject (comp. 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2); 2) Its *answer conditioned* by the need of salvation and the capacity for salvation of those for whom it is made.

Ver. 6. *The penitent confession*—"*We have sinned against the Lord:*" 1) *Who has to make it* (the individual, family, congregation, school and church, the whole people); 2) *How it is to be made* (with attestation of its truth and uprightness by deeds of repentance); 3) *What are its consequences* (forgiveness of sin, deliverance from the power of the wicked one, salvation).

II. *Israel's Victory over the Philistines under the Lead of Samuel.* Vers. 7–14.

7 And when the Philistines heard that the children of Israel were gathered together to Mizpeh [Mizpah[1]], the lords of the Philistines went up against Israel. And

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 7. Mispah is written always with the Art.—"the watch-tower"—the significance of the name continuing to be felt. It is every where Mispah, except in Josh. xviii. 26. Mizpeh was a town in the plain of Judah. —Tr.]

8 when the children of Israel heard it, they were afraid of the Philistines. And the
children of Israel said to Samuel, Cease not to cry unto the Lord [Jehovah] our
9 God for us,[2] that he will save us out of the hand of the Philistines. And Samuel
took a sucking lamb, and offered it[3] for a burnt-offering wholly unto the Lord
[Jehovah], and Samuel cried unto the Lord [Jehovah] for Israel, and the Lord
10 [Jehovah] heard [answered] him. And as Samuel was offering up the burnt-offer-
ing, the Philistines drew near to battle against Israel; but [and] the Lord [Jeho-
hovah] thundered with a great thunder [noise] on that day upon the Philistines,
11 and discomfited[4] them, and they were smitten before Israel. And the men of Is-
rael went out of Mizpeh [Mizpah], and pursued the Philistines, and smote them
12 until [as far as] *they came* [*om.* they came] under Bethcar.[5] Then [And] Samuel
took a stone, and set it between Mizpeh [Mizpah] and Shen,[6] and called the name
of it Eben-ezer, saying [and said], Hitherto[7] hath the Lord [Jehovah] helped us.
13 So [And] the Philistines were subdued,[8] and they [*om.* they] came no more into the
coast of Israel; and the hand of the Lord [Jehovah] was against the Philistines all
14 the days of Samuel. And the cities which the Philistines had taken from Israel
were restored to Israel, from Ekron even [*om.* even] unto Gath; and the coasts
thereof[9] did Israel deliver[10] out of the hands of the Philistines. And there was
peace between Israel and the Amorites.[11]

III. *Summary Statement of Samuel's Judicial Work.* Vers. 15–17.

15, 16 AND Samuel judged Israel all the days of his life. And he went from year
to year[12] in circuit to Bethel, and Gilgal, and Mizpeh [Mizpah], and judged Israel
17 in all those places.[13] And his return was to Ramah,[13] for there was his house; and
there he built an altar unto the Lord [Jehovah].

[2] [Ver. 8. Literally: "keep not silence from us, from crying," *etc.* Comp. Ps. xxviii. 1.—TR.]

[3] [Ver. 9. The Kethib has the shorter personal suffix, the Qeri the longer.—TR.]

[4] [Ver. 10. ויהמם—Qal Imperf. of המם with pronom. suffix.—TR.]

[5] [Ver. 11. For Beth-car Chald. has Beth-sharon, "house of the plain;" and Syr. Bethyashan, "house of age." The second seems a corruption or clerical error; the first is apparently translation of Bethcar, "house of the plain." Whether there is here a reference to the plain of Sharon is uncertain.—TR.]

[6] [Ver. 12. *Shen*, always with the Art.—"the tooth;" that is, "the crag,"—whether name of a town or a rock is not clear. Syr. has Yashan, "ancient," and Sept. τῆς παλαιᾶς, both apparently reading ישן in the Heb., "old,"—from which, however, we can hardly infer that Shen was an inhabited place (Wellhausen).—TR.]

[7] [Ver. 12. Hitherto—that is, "up to this time," not "up to this place."—TR.]

[8] [Ver. 13. Literally: "humbled." Erdmann: *gedemüthigt*.—TR.]

[9] [Ver. 14. That is, of the cities; not (as Sept.) of Israel.—TR.]

[10] [Ver. 14. Syr. wrongly: "the Lord delivered Israel," *etc.* The reference here is to Israel's military prowess.—TR.]

[11] [Ver. 14. Erdmann has, by typographical error, Ammonites.—TR.]

[12] [Ver. 16. כְּדֵי, from מִן, "from," and דַּי, "sufficiency"—"as often as."—TR.]

[13] [Ver. 17. Sept.: "sacred places"—an exegetical paraphrase; or, they read מקדשים instead of מקומות. For Ramah Sept. has Ἀρμαθαίμ. See on chap. i. 1.—TR.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 7–14. *Israel's victory over the Philistines under the lead of Samuel.*—The last words in ver. 6 referred to Samuel's *judicial* work in Mizpah, after the general assembly for repentance and prayer had been held with the whole people. The express mention of this judicial work at the end of the narrative in vers. 2-6 confirms the view (which is besides suggested from the whole connection) that this popular assembly was not concerned with military preparations for an attack on the Philistines, but only with arranging the internal affairs of the national life, the religious-moral and civil, according to the divine law. We have seen how Samuel there acted at the same time as *prophet* and *judge*, and how the function of *priest* connected itself immediately with that of prophet. It now falls to his lot, like the earlier judges, to fulfil his judicial mission against foreign enemies also, and show himself the leader of the people against their oppressors; this he does indeed in quite a different manner, not sword in hand, but wielding the weapons of prayer, and gaining for his people a victory, from which dates the history of Israel's deliverance from the hands of the Philistines.—Ver. 7. The Philistines *hear* of the *assembly* of the children of Israel. Either they supposed it to be a military one, knowing nothing of its real end (*Berl. Bib.*), or they well knew this end, and wished to surprise the Israelites in their unarmed condition (Joseph.). Their princes went *up*, since the assembly was held on the high land, and on Mizpah, which was still higher than this.—The following description of the behaviour of the children of Israel and the conduct of Samuel, there being no hint of arming against the Philistines, or of an attempt by Israel to make a military movement against the advancing foe, shows clearly that the Israelites were not in readiness for such an attack, and had made no military preparations. Not the *arms of Israel* put the Philistines to flight, but the *prayers of Samuel*, and

the thunders above their heads manifesting the might of the Lord, the terrors of which the Philistines had not forgotten since their experience with the ark.—When the Israelites *heard* of the advance of the Philistine princes with their hosts, they were *afraid* of them. This is inconceivable, if the assembly was held to equip themselves inwardly and outwardly for the war of freedom against the Philistines. In ver. 8 the people press Samuel to beseech God with *unceasing* and *instant* crying for their *deliverance* out of the hand of the Philistines. The solicitude corresponds with Samuel's previous promise to pray to the Lord for the people in this assembly (ver. 5). The object of the petition, salvation out of the hand of the Philistines, had already been promised by him on the condition of sincere return to the Lord (ver. 3). Now the moment of fulfilment has come. The condition is complied with, the children of Israel beseech Samuel: "cease not to cry to the Lord, *our* God." They have found their God again, after whom they had till now sighed and mourned. Samuel, having by his intercession first restored the covenant-communion between the penitent people and the pardoning God, now intercedes for the deliverance of the people, and thus performs the judicial act which, for the earlier judges, was coincident with their entrance into their office. Samuel had first, as prophet and judge, to lead the people to a thorough reformation of their inner life, before he could begin the work of external deliverance. He began it as judge and as priest at the same time, as is further related in ver. 9. Samuel represented the people in *twofold priestly function* before the Lord, with *offering* and *prayer*. The offering consisted of a young tender lamb, which was still nourished with milk; though, according to the Law, Lev. xxii. 27, it must have been seven days "with its mother." A burnt-offering (עוֹלָה) is offered as sign of the complete consecration of the whole man, here of the whole people, to the Lord in the consecration and devotion of the whole life to Him, as is set forth by the fact that the whole animal (הַכֹּל Lev. i. 9) was burnt in the fire of the altar, and so ascended [the Heb. word means "that which ascends"], in distinction from the offerings which were only partially burnt on the altar. This is expressed by the addition of the word "wholly" (כָּלִיל) which is also used of the vegetable and meat-offerings which were to be wholly burned (Lev. vi. 15). In poetic language (Deut. xxxiii. 10) it stands for עוֹלָה, burnt offering, while here, as in Ps. li. 21 [19] (there connected by וְ "and") it is an explanatory addition to indicate that the burnt-offering is a *whole*-offering, the offerers not receiving a part of it, as in the Shelamim [peace-offerings] or Zebachim [slain-offerings]. The idea of the *whole*-offering is thus specially again expressed, because the resolution to devote themselves to the Lord fully and undividedly, a devotion conditioned on the whole-hearted conversion and the purpose to serve the Lord alone (ver. 3 sqq.) is expressed by the presentation of the burnt-offering. In accordance with the people's demand (ver. 8) Samuel combined with the offering earnest, instant *prayer* for them.—**And the Lord answered him**, is the declaration that the prayer for help and deliverance was *heard*, comp. Ps. iii. 5; iv. 2. [See also Ps. xcix. 6; Jer. xv. 1, for the estimation in which Samuel's *power in prayer* was held.—Tr.]. The *answer* of the Lord is given in the occurrence related in ver. 10 sqq. in the factual help of the Lord, not merely in the thunder (Keil), though the latter was the cause of the consternation and confusion of the Philistines. The vividness of the description is noticeable: Samuel is engaged in offering the sacrifice, during which the Philistines approach nearer and nearer, Israel is waiting on Samuel's prayer for the Lord's help, terrific peals of thunder follow one after another, thereby the Philistines are confused and confounded (comp. Jos. x. 10), they take to flight, their plan is frustrated.—Ver. 11. The men of Israel now advance from Mizpah, and pursue them as far as under *Bethcar* = "House of the lamb or of the meadow, the field." Jos. *Ant.* VI., 2, 2: *Corræ*. A place called *Corræ* lay between Jericho and Bethshean; V. Raumer (4 ed., p. 178, R. 158 sq.) thinks that it could not be this place. It remains at least doubtful.—After this victory was *won*, a monument was set up in remembrance of the help of the Lord there experienced. Samuel set a memorial stone between *Mizpah* and *Shen* ("*Tooth*," either a prominent rock-formation (comp. ch. xiv. 4) or a place situated on a crag near Mizpah). The name *Ebenezer* ["stone of help"], which he gives it, is at the same time explained: **Hitherto hath the Lord helped us**.—This was the thanksgiving in the name of the whole people as answer to the Lord's answer, the accompanying explanation of the act of thanks. The "hitherto" points to the fact that this victory did not complete the deliverance from the yoke of the Philistines. [Wellhausen would explain Ebenezer as = "this be witness (עֵד) that Jahveh hath helped us."—Tr.].—Vers. 13, 14, state the happy *results* for Israel of this victory over the Philistines, gained without arms, the wonderful gift of God's hand. First is mentioned the *humiliation* [Eng. A. V. "subdued"] of the enemy, in consequence of the manner in which this victory was gained.* It is then declared that, in consequence of this victory, the Philistines made no more such incursions into the coasts of Israel. The following words: "and the hand of the Lord was against the Philistines all the days of Samuel," are improperly restricted to the period of his active judgeship (Lyra, Brent, Nägelsb., Herz. XIII. 403 sq.); since Samuel, according to ver. 15, judged Israel all the days of his life, they must be understood of his whole *life-time*. During this time the Philistines continued to occupy the land (ix. 16; x. 5; xiii. 5, 13), though the occupation was territorially restricted. The continuance of the Philistine oppression is presupposed in these words themselves: "the hand of the Lord was against the Philistines," comp. xiv. 52. After the victory at Mizpah they could gain no *more*

* [The word here employed (כנע), meaning originally "to humble," is also frequently used in the sense of "subdue," and it is better so to understand it here, and not, as Erdmann takes it, in the sense of a humiliation from their perception of the miraculous intervention of God.—In this sentence the words "of the enemy" are not in the German, probably from typographical error; the sense requires some such insertion.—Tr.]

territory, and in Israel's battles with them, however much of the land they still held, the hand of the Lord was mighty against them so long as Samuel lived, therefore during Saul's reign also, since Samuel died only a short time before Saul; the help of the Lord against these mightiest foes of the land continued during Samuel's life-time. See Introduction, p. 9 sq. Thus is intimated the mediating position which Samuel in this respect also assumed between God and the people of Israel as their representative and intercessor.

Ver. 14. A *further consequence* of the victory was the regaining of the cities which belonged to the land of Israel with the territories appertaining to them, lying on the Philistine frontier from Ekron to Gath. These two cities are not included, but indicate on the Philistine side the direction and limits of the space in which the Israelites regained the lost cities and territories. The sense is: "Israel recovered their cities which lay on the Philistine borders, reckoning those borders from Ekron to Gath" (Seb. Schmid). Finally, a consequence of the abasement of the Philistines was the *peace between Israel and the Amorites.* These "are mentioned here, because they were in the region in question next to the Philistines the mightiest enemies of Israel, comp. Josh. x.; Judg. i. 34 sqq." (Thenius). According to the latter passage (Judg. i. 34) they "especially forced the Danites back out of the plain into the mountains" (Keil).*

Vers. 15–17. Summary view of Samuel's *judicial work.* Ver. 15 gives the *duration* of his office; that the latter dates from the day of Mizpah (Keil) is by no means certain; but its precise commencement is not stated. **All the days of his life** denotes the period up to his death. His sons were his assistants up to the establishment of the kingdom. During Saul's government he kept unchanged the position of a prophet, who employed the authority of the divine will for the direction of the national life, the mediating priestly position between God and the people; but he also, as last Judge, held in his hands the highest control of the theocracy and the kingdom.

Ver. 16 sqq. *The way in which he fulfilled the duties of the office.* He went round every year, holding court at three places: Bethel, Gilgal and Mizpah. These were at the same time holy places, in which Jehovah was worshiped, where therefore the people could be more easily brought together in large assemblies, and those who desired legal decisions could more easily meet Samuel. Ewald's supposition that Samuel visited one of these places at each of the great annual feasts is properly objected to by Thenius, with the remark "that at that time there was hardly a regular feast." The question whether this *Gilgal* was the old place in the Jordan-valley between the Jordan and Jericho (Josh. iv. 19), or the one southwest of Shiloh near the Jerusalem-road, now Jiljilia (Deut. xi. 38; 1 Kings ii. 1), must be decided in favor of the former, for the reason that Samuel would certainly choose for such assemblies the place which was consecrated by its historical association and its religious importance. The order of the names here does not warrant us in deciding (Keil) in favor of the other, the northern Gilgal.—אֵת כָּל־הַמְּ׳ [Eng. A. V.: "in all those places"] must be taken as local Accus., and אֵת as Acc. particle. It cannot here mean "near;" "it is used indeed to express the *proximity* of *one place* to *another* (Judg. iv. 11; 1 Kings ix. 26), and still oftener of things or persons to *persons*, but not that things or persons are *close by places*, for which we find only עִם or בְּ (Josh. xxiv. 26; Judg. xviii. 3)" (Böttcher).—Ver. 17. From his circuits Samuel returned always to *Ramah.* Here was his permanent *residence* as householder. In respect to his work there, we have *two* brief statements: 1) he **acted as judge**, when he was not absent on his circuit. (On שָׁפָט, Ew., *Gr.*, § 138 *a*: "the ă of the Perf. becomes ā only in pause, except once in 1 Sam. vii. 17.") His judicial labors were therefore *uninterrupted.* 2) **There he built an altar to the Lord.**—The priesthood had declined, the central sanctuary was broken up; instead of the local and the institutional-personal uniting point in the high-priest, Samuel forms from now on for the religious life and service also of Israel the personal centre consecrated by God's choice and guidance. His *priestly* work continues along with his *judicial*, both embraced and supported by the *prophetical.* Besides the already-existing holy places, where prayer and sacrifice were offered to God, he makes *his residence* a place of worship. The *direction* and *furtherance* of matters of religious life and worship is in his hands. Having effected a thorough reformation of the deep-sunken theocratic life on the basis of the renewed relation between God and the people, he now proceeds vigorously, as judge, priest and prophet, to *build it up* and *finish* it on this foundation.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. On the significance of the *burnt-offering* as a *whole offering*, see on ver. 8. It is the *sacrificium latreuticum* [latreutic sacrifice, or sacrifice of service], since, by the complete consecration of the animal, it denotes, for the individual and the nation, the complete consecration and devotion of the whole life to the Lord. The burnt-offering has a propitiatory significance for the offerer in a general way (not, however, in respect to particular offences which require special expiation), on which see Oehler in Herz., *R. E.* X. 635. The fresh, tender, sucking lamb, which was used in the offering at Mizpah, was intended, perhaps, to set forth how the people, new-born by their conversion, should, in the first freshness of their new life, dedicate themselves wholly and undividedly to the Lord, to be His property and serve Him. The conjunction of the burnt-offering with prayer is founded on the fact, that both express the same *disposition* of complete *consecration* of the heart to God.

* [The name "Amorite" is given to various tribes on both sides of the Jordan, and either the race was a widely extended one, or the name is sometimes used in a general way for the inhabitants of Palestine. The word is now generally held to mean "mountaineers" (Num. xiii. 29), and is by some supposed to be a local, rather than a tribal designation, but in Judg. i. 34 the Amorites seem to be dwellers in the plain. Apparently they had been at war with the Israelites before Samuel's victory.—Tr.]

2. The *sacrificial service*, together with *prayer*, was conducted for the whole people by *Samuel* (as formerly by Moses, Ex. xvii. 9; xxxii. 25 sqq.), though he was simply a Levite, and not a priest; for he acted as mediator between God and His people by virtue of His prophetical character and work alone. He therefore filled the office of priest in an extraordinary way, sentence of rejection having been passed on its legal incumbents. On Samuel's further priestly work in offering sacrifices at the holy places of the land, comp. ix. 12; x. 8; xi. 15; xiii. 8 sqq.; xvi. 2 sqq. Samuel exercised the priestly function of prayer and intercession elsewhere, xii. 16 sqq.; xv. 11, 35.

3. In the period of the Judges the *prophetic* work was completely (with the single exception of Deborah, Judg. iv. 4 sqq.) separate from the *judicial*, and the former was as good as absorbed in the latter; both are again united in the person of Samuel, in that he thus shows how the external guidance of the covenant-people can and ought to rest essentially only on an internal, religious-legal foundation. "As he is thus the founder of the kingdom in its genuine theocratic form, so is his priestly work also the preparation for the flourishing condition to which the cultus attained in the Davidic-Solomonic period; it was necessary to break with the law-opposing priesthood of Eli and his race, in order that the establishment of a true priesthood, as it was new-formed under David and Solomon, might become possible" (Hävern., *Vorles. über bibl. Theol.*). The basis for this was given in the Law itself by its teaching of the ideal priesthood, which was to find its realization in the whole people, comp. Ex. xix. 6: "Ye shall be to me a kingdom of priests." Like Moses, who during the seven days of the consecration of the ordinary priests, acted as priest (Lev. viii.), and with priestly petition interceded for the people with the Lord (Ex. xvii.; xxxii. 31, 32; Ps. cvi. 23), so Samuel also, on the ground of this ideal priesthood, whose essential elements were sincere union and communion with God, the might of faith, and the gift of the Holy Spirit and the power of prayer, had the divinely-given right, under existing circumstances, when the institution of the priesthood had sunk and left a terrible gap, to discharge the duties of the ordinary priesthood in sacrifice and prayer; and the first exercise of this priestly calling, to represent the people before God with intercession and prayer, was at the request of the people themselves who through him had been turned to God. See the two-fold testimony of the Scripture to Samuel's power in prayer, Ps. xcix. 6; Jer. xv. 1, and comp. Sir. xlvi. 19 sqq. As to his subsequent praying, see viii. 6; xii. 16-23; xv. 18.

4. The monument between Mizpah and Shen represents an important epoch in the history of Samuel. What he, and through him the Lord, had hitherto done for Israel stamped him as the great reformer of the Theocracy, and secured the restoration of a united national and theocratic life in its fundamental characteristics, and on the most essential foundations. The victory over the Philistines supplied the capstone. In all that happened up to this victory and the consequent freer position of the people over against the world without, he recognizes the Lord's help, setting forth this recognition in the humble acknowledgment "hitherto," *etc.*, while he at the same time points to the future, and shows the need for further help from the Lord in respect to what is still to be done. The stone Ebenezer is a monument of those revelations of the might and the grace of the living God, occasioned by sin and penitence, wandering and return, which are the impelling power in the whole political history of the Old Covenant.

[Wordsworth: What a contrast between the event now recorded at Ebenezer, and that recorded as having occurred a few years before at the same place (1 Sam. iv. 1)! At that time Israel had the ark with them, the visible sign of God's presence; but the Lord Himself had forsaken them on account of their sins; . . . . the priests were slain, and the ark was taken. Now they have not the ark, but they have repented of their sins, and Samuel is with them, and the Lord hearkens to His prayers, and the Philistines are smitten. . . . . Hence it appears that outward ordinances are of no avail without holiness, and that God can raise up Samuels, and endue them with extraordinary graces, and enable them to do great acts, and give comfort and victory to the Church of God by their means.—Tr.]

5. On the total significance of Samuel's position and work at this epoch of the development of the Old Testament history, see the remarks in the preceding exegetical elucidations.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 7-14. *Need teaches to pray:* 1) *Whom?* Only him who (a) lets himself be drawn by need with penitent heart and believing mind unto God, in order to seek help from Him, and (b) despairs of helping himself by his own power, and relies only on God's hand; 2) *How?* (a) heartily, (b) unceasingly; 3) *With what result?* (a) God hears, (b) God delivers from the need.

[Ver. 7. Henry: 1) How evil sometimes seems to come out of good. The religious meeting of the Israelites at Mizpah brought trouble upon them from the Philistines, which, perhaps, tempted them to wish they had staid at home. . . . So when sinners begin to repent and reform, they must expect that Satan will muster all his force against them. 2) How good is at length brought out of that evil. Israel could never be threatened more seasonably than at this time, when they were repenting and praying . . . bad policy for the Philistines to *make war* upon Israel at a time when they were *making their peace* with God. . . . Thus He makes man's wrath to praise Him.—Tr.]

Vers. 8-10. *The power of believing prayer in threatening peril:* 1) As an *earnest* pressing to the heart of God in view of the greatness of the peril; 2) As a *constant* supplication for His help in view of the tardiness of help in the midst of peril; 3) As a *perfect* self-devotion to the Lord in view of the ever-increasing peril.

Vers. 7-12. *The life of prayer in communion with God:* 1) Calling on the Lord; 2) Answer from the Lord; 3) Thanksgiving to the Lord.

[Ver. 9. ("And Samuel cried . . . and the Lord answered him"). *Samuel's power in prayer.* 1) Asking such great things; 2) Answered so

promptly. Note that Samuel was himself the child of prayer. Also that "the forty years' domination of the Philistines over Israel (Judg. xiii. 1) could not be overthrown by the supernatural strength of Samson, but was terminated by the prayers of Samuel" (Wordsworth). As Abraham was the great pattern of faith and Job of patience, so Samuel appears to have been always afterwards regarded as a grand example of power in prayer, Ps. xcix. 6; Jer. xv. 1.—Tr.]

Ver. 12. *The cry, Ebenezer, Hitherto hath the Lord helped us*, a cry 1) Of *thankful recollection* of past experiences of the Lord's help (*hitherto!*); 2) Of *humble testimony* before the Lord, that nothing has been done by our power, and that His help alone has maintained and preserved our life; 3) Of *confident* hope, in view of further need of help to the same end.

"Here I raise my Ebenezer,
Hither by Thy help I'm come;
And I hope, by Thy good pleasure,
Safely to arrive at home."

[These well-known lines are given as equivalent to a German hymn which Erdmann refers to but does not quote.—Tr.]

[*Samuel a pattern to religious Reformers:* (1) In early life, amid evils he could not cure, he yet gained the confidence of all (chap. iii. 19-21; iv. 1; xii. 2-4). (2) After long waiting he saw and seized the opportunity of effecting a reformation (vii. 2, 3). (3) He put the inward first, but insisted also on outward reform (vers. 3, 4). (4) He did not rely on preaching alone, but was much in prayer (vers. 5, 8, 9). (5) He gave all the glory to God (ver. 12). (6) He strove by wise and faithful administration to make the reformation permanent.—Tr.]

SECOND PART. SAUL.

Chs. VIII.-XXXI.

FIRST DIVISION.

ESTABLISHMENT BY SAMUEL OF THE ISRAELITISH KINGDOM UNDER THE RULE OF SAUL. Chaps. VIII.—XII.

FIRST SECTION.

The Preparations. Chapters VIII. IX.

I. *The Persistent Desire of the People after a King conveyed through their Elders to Samuel.*

Chap. VIII. 1-22.

1 And it came to pass, when Samuel was old, that he made his sons judges over
2 Israel. Now [And] the name of his first-born was Joel,[1] and the name of his [the]
3 second Abiah[2]; they were judges in Beersheba. And his sons walked not in his
ways, but turned aside after lucre,[3] and took bribes, and perverted judgment.
4 Then [And] all the elders of Israel gathered themselves together, and came to
5 Samuel to Ramah, And said unto him, Behold, thou art old, and thy sons walk
6 not in thy ways; now make us a king to judge us like all the nations. But [And]
the thing displeased Samuel when they said, Give us a king to judge us. And Sa-
7 muel prayed unto the Lord [Jehovah]. And the Lord [Jehovah] said unto Samuel,
Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee; for they have
not rejected thee,[4] but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them.
8 According to all the works which they have done since the day that I brought them
up out of Egypt even unto this day, wherewith they have forsaken [forsaking][5] me

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 2. That is "Jehovah is God"—the only God (יוֹ — יְהוֹ — יְהוּ — יָהוּ for יְהוָֹה, Jahveh), a name borne by several persons in O. T., and said by Schrader to occur on the Assyr. inscriptions as name of a king of Hamath, Jalu, borrowed, no doubt, from the Israelites.—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 2. That is, "my father (or, simply, father) is Jah, Jahu, Jahveh, Jehovah." The word מִשְׁנֵהוּ means the "second," not of Samuel, but of Joel.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 3. בֶּצַע is sometimes "profit" in general, as in Gen. xxxvii. 26, but usually "unjust gain," as here. The Targ. renders "mamon (mammon) of deceit," see Luke xvi. 9. In Talmud and Targ. mammon means "money," "riches," and Augustine (*Quæst. Evan.* 34) says that it was the Punic word for "money." It is not found in Heb., and its origin is obscure.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 7. Better: "not thee have they rejected, but me have, *etc.*"—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 8. Literally: "according to all . . . they have done . . . and have forsaken me and served, *etc.*" The ו consec., according to Heb. usage, introduces an appositional explanatory phrase, properly rendered by Eng. particip. On the Sept. insertion of "to me" after "have done," see Exeg. Notes *in loco*.—Tr.]

and served [serving] other gods, so do they also [*om.* also] unto thee [*ins.* also].
9 Now therefore [And now] hearken unto their voice; howbeit [*om.* howbeit] yet
protest solemnly unto [solemnly warn][6] them, and show them the manner[7] of the
king that shall reign over them.
10 And Samuel told all the words of the Lord [Jehovah] to the people that asked
11 of him a king. And he said, This will be the manner of the king that shall reign
over you: He will take your sons, and appoint them for himself, for his chariots,
and to be his horsemen [put them in his chariot and on his horses[8]], and *some* [they]
12 shall run before his chariots [chariot]. And he will appoint[9] him captains over
thousands and captains over fifties, and *will set them* [*some he will set*] to ear [plough]
his ground, and to reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war and [*ins.*
13 the] instruments [equipment] of his chariots. And he will take your daughters to
be confectionaries [perfumers],[10] and to be [*om.* to be] cooks, and to be [*om.* to be]
14 bakers. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your oliveyards,
15 *even* [*om.* even] the best of them, and give them to his servants. And he will take
the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers, and to his
16 servants. And he will take your men-servants, and your maid-servants, and your
17 goodliest young men [oxen],[11] and your asses, and put them to his work. He will
18 take the tenth of your sheep; and ye shall be his servants. And ye shall cry out
in that day because of your king which [whom] ye shall have chosen you, and the
Lord [Jehovah] will not hear you in that day.
19 Nevertheless [And] the people refused to obey [hearken to] the voice of Samuel.
20 And they said, Nay, but we will have a king over us; That [And] we also may
[will] be like all the nations, and that [*om.* that] our king may [shall] judge us,
21 and go out before us, and fight our battles. And Samuel heard all the words of
the people, and he rehearsed them in the ears of the Lord [Jehovah]. And the
22 Lord [Jehovah] said to Samuel, Hearken unto their voice, and make them a king.
And Samuel said unto the men of Israel, Go ye every man unto his city.

[6] [Ver. 9. אַךְ is restrictive-adversative, "yet," "nevertheless;" כִּי is the subst. conjunct. "that," introducing the following affirmation. The verb means literally "testify to them," the word "solemnly" well expresses the force of the Inf. Abs.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 9. מִשְׁפָּט is "judgment," then "law," then "right, privilege," but also "manner," and this last is preferable here, because Samuel states what the king will do, not what he will have the right to do. His "manner" will be the "law" as determined by himself.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 11. The word signifies either "horses" or "horsemen;" the former better suits construction and context.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 12. Lit. "and to appoint," Inf. dependent on the verb "take" in ver. 11. The vss. vary greatly in the designation of the officers here mentioned, and some critics would read (with Sept.) "hundreds" instead of "fifties," as being the more usual and natural. This is, however, a ground of objection to the change (from the harder to the easier), and there is no sufficient reason for abandoning the Heb. text.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 13. The word רקח is used to express the preparing of fragrant ointments (Ex. xxx. 22–35), and the noun is here best rendered "ointment-makers," so Sept., Vulg., Erdmann, Philippson, and others. The Syriac renders "weavers" (websters) as if it read רקם, and the Chald. has the general designation "servants" (comp. Arab. *raqaka*, "provide for"). The Heb. text is to be maintained. The Eng. word "confectionary" (=confectioner) formerly included the making of ointments and spiced preparations, see Ex. xxx. 35, Eng. A. V., but would now convey an incorrect idea here.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 16. The reading "oxen" instead of "young men" (בקר for בחר) seems required by context, and is given by Sept., and adopted by Erdmann and others. Maurer admits the bearing of the context, but keeps the text on the ground of the טוֹבִים; but טוֹב is applied to oxen in Gen. xli. 26, and to flesh of beasts in Ez. xxiv. 4 (in ver. 5 Ezek. uses בחר of the flock), and may be here understood of oxen.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1-3. *Samuel's sons*, Joel and Abiah, associated with him as judges over Israel.—The *reason* here given, why Samuel made his two sons judges, is his *age*, for which his work, as sketched in vii. 15-17, had become too hard. The two sons, Joel and Abiah, are also mentioned in 1 Chr. vi. 13 [Eng. A. V. ver. 28], where, however, in the masoretic text, the name of the first has fallen out.* [These names may be taken as indications of the father's pious feeling. The first, Joel, "Jehovah is God," was, not improbably, a protest against the idolatry of the Israelites. Hebrew names thus frequently serve as historical finger-signs, pointing out prevailing tendencies or modes of feeling at certain times. Comp. Ichabod (1 Sam. iv. 21, 22), Saul's sons Meribbaal (Mephibosheth) and Ishbaal (Ishbosheth), David's sons (2 Sam. iii. 2–5), Manasseh the King, Malachi. The name of Samuel's second son, Abiah, "Jehovah is father," expresses trust in the fatherhood of God, an idea which hardly appears in O. T. except in proper names. "It records, doubtless, the fervent aspiration of him who first de-

* [The Vashni in 1 Chr. vi. 13 (28) is the same word as that rendered "second" in this passage.—Tr.]

vised it as a name, and, we may hope, of many who subsequently adopted it, after that endearing and intimate relationship between God and the soul of man, which is truly expressed by the words 'father' and 'child.' It may be accepted as proof that believers in ancient days, though they had not possession of the perfect knowledge of 'the mystery of God and of the Father and of Christ,' or of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, nevertheless 'received the Spirit of adoption,' that God 'sent forth the Spirit of His Son into their hearts, whereby they cried, Abba, Father'" (Wilkinson, *Personal Names in the Bible*, page 169 sq.).—Tr.].—They acted as judges in *Beer-sheba*, "Well of the seven (that is, lambs), or of the oath" (Gen. xxi. 28–33), the spot consecrated by the Patriarchal history (Gen. xxii. 19; xxvi. 23; xxviii. 10), in the extreme south of the country, on the border of Edom, now Bir-es-seba ["Well of the seven, or of the lion"] (Robins. I. 337 [Amer. Ed. I., 204 sq.]).* Josephus (*Ant.* VI., 3, 2) adds, "in Bethel" after "judges," thus intimating that one son acted in the North, the other in the South, both together comprising the whole country in their judicial work, according to which Samuel had wholly retired; but against this is the previous statement that Samuel exercised his office "all the days of his life," and therefore his sons could only have been appointed by him assistants in the performance of duties which his old age rendered too arduous for him. Ewald's opinion that this addition of Josephus "*suits* so well," that "he must have gotten it from a still better account in the histories of the Kings," is a mere surmise, over against which we may put with equal right the opinion that Josephus was indebted for this addition (Nägelsb.) to his "very lively fancy" (Then.), and that the Masoretic text *fits in so well* with the whole historical situation, that the integrity of the passage cannot be assailed. Since, on the one hand, our attention is directed to Samuel's age,† which compelled him to make his sons judges, while yet he did not lay down his office, and, on the other hand, the desire after a firm and energetic royal power was based on the dangerous condition of the country by reason of foreign enemies, it appears that Samuel, in order to lighten the burden, set his sons as judges in a part of the land, and in the part which occasioned the greatest difficulties and exertions, that is, the southern. Ver. 3 affirms that this measure was a failure. In consequence of the division of the judicial power between the father and the sons, the authority of the office was so debased in the eyes of the people by the crimes of the latter, as the sacerdotal dignity was by the sons of Eli, that the desire for a higher authority to guide the people found utterance.—**They took bribes and perverted judgment.**—They thus transgressed the *law* of the Lord (Ex. xxiii. 6, 8; comp. Deut. xvi. 19), and destroyed the foundation of the judicial office as the office for the administration of right and justice. Their official unfaithfulness is contrasted with their *father's walk:* **they walked not in his ways.**—This fact or judgment alone is given, and Samuel is not, like Eli, charged with the blame of his sons' misconduct. The words: **they inclined** or **turned aside** (namely, from the ways of their father*) **after lucre,** exhibit the roots of their wicked official procedure in a mind directed to gain. Luther gives the correct sense: "they turned aside to *covetousness.*"

Vers. 4–9. *The demand for a king*—vers. 4, 5, how it was made, ver. 6, how it was received by Samuel and carried before the Lord, vers. 7–9, how he, and through him the people, was instructed concerning it by the Lord.

Vers. 4, 5. "*All the elders* of Israel" assemble in Ramah, Samuel's judicial seat. Thus the whole nation is in motion against the existing condition of things; it appears before Samuel officially and formally in the body of its representatives. *Two things* they adduce as *ground* of the demand which they wish to make: 1) Samuel's *age*, that is, the lack of vigor and energy in the government, which, with his advancing age, made itself perceptible to the whole nation, and was not supplied by the assistance of his sons, which he had for that reason (ver. 1) called in; 2) the *evil walk*, the misgovernment of his sons, the moral and legal depravation which they produced. The *demand* is: **Make us a king** (Acts xiii. 21); and two things are added: 1) in reference to his judicial work: *he was to judge;* the royal office was to take the place of the judicial, and so the meaning of the demand is a complete abrogation of the hitherto existing form of government under judges; 2) in reference to the royal-monarchical constitution of the surrounding nations: the Israelitish constitution is to be *like that* (כְּ). After the words "as all the nations," we must supply "have such a one." Israel will not be behind other nations in respect to the splendor and power of royal rule. The accordance of the last words: "like all the nations" with Deut. xvii. 14 is to be noted.—In ver. 6 two things are said of *Samuel's conduct* in reference to this demand. First, that he received it with *displeasure* (וַיֵּרַע, properly: "the thing was evil in the eyes of Samuel"). But the cause of his displeasure is expressly said to be, that they made the demand: "Give us a king to judge us." He did not, therefore, take it amiss that they blamed the wrong-doing of his sons, nor that they referred to his age, and thus intimated that he was no longer able to bear the whole burden of the office, while his sons did evilly. What displeased him was the expression of desire for a king as ruler. How far and why this demand was the occasion of his displeasure appears from the connection. From the words of Samuel (xii. 12) we see 1) that the people, pressed anew by the Ammonites, demanded a king who should give them the protection against enemies, which was not expected

* [Beersheba (a mere watering-place in the Patriarchal time) was probably at this time a place of some importance from the trade between Egypt and Asia. It was re-settled after the exile, was a large village with a Roman garrison in Jerome's time, and now exhibits only scattered ruins. Two large, and five small wells are still to be seen. The name does not occur in the New Test. See Robins. *ubi sup.*, Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, *s. v.*—Tr.]

† [If Samuel was born B. C. 1146, he would be sixty years old at the third battle of Ebenezer, 1086, and now, say ten years later, seventy years old. This would leave twenty years for Saul's reign up to B. C. 1056, when David was made king in Hebron.—But it is possible that these dates may have to be put forward some years.—Tr.]

* [Or, from the ways of truth.—Tr.]

from the aging Samuel; 2) that, in this demand, they left out of view the kingdom of God in their midst, turned away their heart from the God who had hitherto as their almighty king so often saved them from the power of the enemy, and put their trust in an external, visible kingdom as means of safety and protection against their enemies, over against the invisible royal rule of their God, whose instrument, Samuel, they rejected. The same thing is expressed in the words of Samuel, ch. x. 18, 19. In both passages, however, Samuel's discourse is an echo of the word of God Himself, imparted to him in answer to the question which he had asked God in prayer. This, namely, is the *second* important factor in Samuel's procedure: **He prayed to the Lord.** Deeply moved by the sin which, in this demand, the people committed against the Lord as their king (and this was the real occasion of his displeasure and unwillingness in reference to the desired revolution in the political constitution, which was connected with the rejection of himself as representative and instrument of the divine government), he carried the whole matter before the Lord in prayer, and, in this important crisis also of the history of his people, who would no longer be guided by him, showed himself the humble, consecrated man and hero of prayer.—In vers. 7–9 we have the declaration, in which the Lord *instructs* Samuel as to the question of his prayer, and at the same time *decides* on the demand of the people. Prayer was the best means by which Samuel could learn the purpose and will of God in reference to this demand of the nation. The words: **Hearken to the voice of the people**, express the divine fulfillment of the people's request. Here a discrepancy might be supposed to exist between this statement and Samuel's reception of the request in ver. 6. But the appearance of such a discrepancy vanishes before the following considerations. An earthly-human kingdom could not at all, merely as such, stand in opposition with the revealed theocratic relation of the covenant-God with His people, in which the latter (Ex. xix. 5 sq.) were to be His property and a "kingdom" of priests, and He was to be their king (comp. Ex. xv. 18: "Jehovah is king forever," with Ps. xliv. 5; lxviii. 25; lxxiv. 12; x. 16). For, if hitherto under the Theocracy chosen instruments of the Lord, like Moses, Joshua and the Judges, were the leaders of the people, governing them by His law, in His name and according to His will, then also a leader and governor of the people, depending solely on God's will, governing solely in His name, and devoted to His law, intended and desiring to be nothing but the instrument of the invisible king in respect to His people, might rule over them with the power and dignity of a king. A king, as God's instrument, chosen by God the royal ruler of His people out of their midst, could no more stand opposed to the fundamental idea of the theocracy, than all the former great leaders and guides of the people, who were chosen by Him for the realization of His will. This conception of the absolute dependence of an earthly-human kingdom in Israel on the invisible King of the nation is expressed in the so-called law of the king in Deut. xvii. 14–20. As to the theocratical idea of a king, comp. Gen. xvii. 6, 16; xxxv. 11; Num. xxiv. 17. There is little occasion to suppose a contradiction between this idea of a theocratically-conditioned Israelitish kingdom and the Theocracy in Israel, when we consider the *need* of a unifying power for the whole national life *within* and *without*, as in Gideon's time against the Midianites (Judg. viii. 22, 23), and now, in the time of the aged Samuel, both against the arbitrary rule and legal disorder of his sons, and against the Ammonites (xii. 12) and the Philistines (ix. 16). If Israel's desire for a king had been in itself opposed to the theocratic principle, Samuel would not have carried the matter to the Lord in prayer, but would have given a decided refusal to the Elders, and the divine decision would not have been: "Hearken to the voice of the people, make them a king" (ver. 22). But the reason of Samuel's necessary displeasure at this desire clearly appears from the judgment passed on it in the divine response: **they have not rejected thee; but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them.**—In their request for a king, they did not assume the attitude of heart and of mind to the Lord, which was proper for them as His people, towards Him as their sole and exclusive ruler. They put out of sight the divine rule, to which, in view of its mighty deeds in their history, they ought to have trusted implicitly, that it would extend to them the oft-verified protection against external enemies and maladministration of the office of Judge; this protection they expect from the earthly-human kingly rule, instead of from God; instead of crying to God to give them a ruler according to His will, they demand from Samuel that a king be made according to their will and pleasure; instead of their holy civil constitution under the royal rule of their covenant-God, they desire a constitution under a visible kingdom, as they see it in the heathen nations. This was a denial of that highest truth which Gideon once (Judg. viii. 23), in declining the royal authority offered him, held up before the people: "The Lord is your king." In rejecting Samuel's government, they rejected the rule of God, and, straying from the foundation of covenant-revelation to the standpoint of the heathen nations, they put themselves in opposition to the royal majesty of God revealed among them, and to the high calling which they had to maintain and fulfil in fidelity and obedience towards the holy and almighty God as their king and ruler. In ver. 8 is shown how this disposition and conduct had been exhibited in the history of the people from God's first great royal deed, the deliverance out of Egypt, till now, and how this new demand addressed to Samuel was only the old sin showing itself, the faithless and apostate disposition which had exhibited itself again and again up to this time. "With such a disposition the desire for a kingdom was a despising and rejecting of Jehovah's kingdom, and no better than forsaking Jehovah to serve other gods" (Keil, *in loco*). (It is not necessary to insert a Pron. "to me" after "they have done" (Thenius), since this is involved in the following words: "they have forsaken me"). In ver. 9 Samuel is again expressly instructed to yield to the desire of the people; but there is added the *twofold injunction:* 1) *bear witness against*

them, that is, attest and set before them their sin and guilt against me, and 2) announce to them *what kind of right the king*, who according to their desire shall rule over them like the kings of the heathen nations, will *claim* in the exercise of unlimited and arbitrary power, after the manner of those rulers. By the first the people are to be made to see how, in the *disposition* of heart in which they demand a king, they stand in opposition to the absolute, holy royal rule of their God, and to their own theocratic calling. The fulfilment of the people's desire after a king which had its root in an apostate and carnally proud temper, is in accordance with the same fundamental law of the Old Covenant, by which the holy God, on the one hand, judges Israel's sin as a contradiction of His holy will, but at the same time, on the other hand, uses it as a means for the realization of the ends of His kingdom, as an occasion for a new development of His revealed glory. The other injunction, to set before the people the *right* [or, manner] of the king they demanded, is intended to exhibit to them the human kingdom apart from the divine rule, as it exists among the other nations, with all its usual and established despotism, as the source of great misfortune and shameful servitude, in contrast with the freedom and happiness offered to the people under the despised Theocracy. Comp. ver. 18.

Vers. 10–18. *The right of the king.*

Ver. 10. **And Samuel told all the words of the Lord to the people.**—This declaration of Samuel was therefore essentially an exhortation to repentance, which set before the people that, by their desire for a king, they had principially *rejected God's sole rule* over them. Clericus: "Therefore God declares that He was despised by the Israelites, inasmuch as they were not content with the theocracy, which had heretofore existed."—The *mishpat* (מִשְׁפָּט, "right," "manner") is here what pertains to the king in the maintenance of courtly state, and what he claims from his subjects, according to the custom of heathen rulers and to kingly usage; for it was with their eyes on the kings of other nations that the people had demanded a king. Joseph.: τὰ παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐσόμενα, *morem regis et agendi rationem* ["the manner of the king"]. Maurer: *id quod rex suo arbitrio vivens impune faciet* ["what the king, following his own will, would do with impunity"]. Clericus: "It signifies the manner of his life (ii. 13; Gen. xl. 13; Judg. xiii. 12),—not legal right (*jus*), for several unjust things are afterwards mentioned, such as were practiced by the neighboring kings, whom in fact the Hebrew kings afterwards imitated." Sept. δικαίωμα ["legal right or ordinance"]. The words: **he will take your sons . . . his chariot**, present a single comprehensive statement of the employment of the young men of the people in the royal *court*. The first sing. of the text "in his chariot" is to be retained (against Then., who, after Sept., Chald., and Syr., reads the Plu., and refers it to war-chariots), and the *chariot* is in both cases to be understood as the court and state-chariot, the service of which is described in accordance with the actual manner of oriental courts. In this there were 1) *Chariot-drivers*, who are referred to in the words "he will put them in his chariot;" 2) *Riders*, indicated by the phrase "on his horses" (פָּרָשׁ is here "saddle-horse," as in 1 Kings v. 6 [Eng. A. V. iv. 26*])—"he will put them on his saddle-horses," and 3) *Runners*—"and they will run before his chariot." It is a description of the usual royal equipage of chariots and horses. Comp. 1 Kings v. 6 [iv. 26], 2 Sam. xv. 1.—Ver. 12 refers partly to *military service*, partly to *agricultural* service. "*And to set*"† depends on "he will take;" the twice-used לוֹ ["for himself"] indicates his purely *selfish* aim. The "captains over thousands and fifties"‡ represent the whole army in all its grades between these highest and lowest positions. For the charge of the "captain over fifty" comp. 2 Kings i. 9–14.—All the *tillage* of the royal possessions must be performed by them; it is described by its *beginning* and *end* (ploughing and reaping). To this is added the work of the royal *artificers* for *war* and *peace*.—Ver. 13. The *daughters* of the people will be employed in the service of the royal *household*. [Women were, in ancient times, cooks, bakers, and preparers of ointments and spices. This last work embraced the preparation of highly-seasoned food, meats and drinks, and of perfumed oils for anointing the body. The household of oriental princes is even now organized on a gigantic scale, and there are indications that a similar luxury was practiced by the nations who lived about the Israelites. All this, as well as the use of horses and chariots, though not absolutely forbidden in the Law, was contrary to its spirit.—Tr.]. Vers. 14 sqq. describe the arbitrary *dealing* of the *king* with the *property* of the people in order to enrich his courtiers. סָרִיס is properly "a eunuch," then any court-officer.—Vers. 16 sqq. The king will use the serving-classes also, *men-servants*, *maid-servants*, and *cattle*, for himself, and will take the tenth of the small cattle [sheep, *etc.*]. For "young men" (בחור) we must read "cattle" (בקר) with Sept. (τὰ βουκόλια), since the young men are already included in the *sons* in ver. 11 [and the *men-servants* in ver. 16.—Tr.], and here both the juxtaposition of servants and animals and the correspondence between the two clauses, men, maids—oxen, asses (comp. Ex. xx. 17) would be destroyed by this inappropriate word. Small cattle are here named in addition to large cattle, to show how completely the king would claim their property for his own uses.—**And you shall be his servants.** These words include all that is said before; the loss of *political* and *social* freedom is connected with the kingdom which the people demand "as among the heathen nations." Thus the folly of their reference to the example of other nations is held up before them in contrast with the freedom and blessing, which they enjoyed under the rule of their invisible king, the living God.—Ver. 18. Their painful condition under such a government will be matter of unavailing lamentation before the Lord. מִלִּפְנֵי כִי is not "*because of* your king," but properly "*from your king*," that is, to the Lord. It is herein

* [Eng. A. V. has here, not so well, "horsemen."—Tr.]

† [This is the literal translation. Eng. A. V. gives the sense more freely.—Tr.]

‡ [On the variations in the vss. as to these numbers, see "Text. and Gram." *in loco*.—Tr.]

hinted that they will wish to be delivered from the oppressive royal government. But the Lord will continue to shut His ears. Clericus: "God will not for your sake change the government of a master into the free commonwealth which you have hitherto enjoyed. The yoke once assumed you must bear forever." The evil which their own sin has brought on them they must bear—so divine justice ordains.

Vers. 19-22. *The result* of the transactions between Samuel and the people.—Vers. 19, 20. *The reply of the people* (through the elders). They "refused to hearken to Samuel's voice." The voice or address of Samuel contained enough to detach the people from their desire. Instead of this there follows, with a decided "no,"* the repetition of the demand: "There shall be a king over us." The dehortatory description of the royal privilege and custom among the surrounding nations is met with the declaration: "And we also will be *as* all the nations." In this there is an ignoring and denying the lofty position which God the Lord had given His people *above* all nations by choosing them as His people, and establishing His royal rule among them. The demand for a kingdom like that of other nations was an act of sin against the Lord, who wished to be sole king over His people, and had sufficiently revealed Himself as such in their former history. "*Judging*" and "*leading in war*" are summarily mentioned as representing the duties of the king to be chosen. Without and within, in war and in peace, he was to be leader and governor of the people.—Ver. 21 sqq. *Samuel's intermediation.* As mediator between God and the people he had hitherto striven with God in prayer, and with the elders of the people in earnest dealings and warnings concerning this important and eventful question. We see him wrestling anew with God in prayer; again he carries before the Lord in prayer the whole matter, as it now stands after the unsuccessful dealing with the people. God's answer is: **Make them a king.** The demand, made in sin, from a disposition not well-pleasing to God, is fulfilled. The element of sin and error must, in the history of the kingdom of God, aid in the preparation and realization of the divine plans and ends. Samuel dismisses the men of Israel to their homes. We must here read between the lines, that Samuel communicated the divine decision to the people, and, dismissing the elders of the people, took into consideration, in accordance with the Lord's command, the necessary steps for the election of a king. Following the sense, Josephus adds to the words of dismissal the following: "And I will send for you at the proper time, when I learn from the Lord whom he will give you as king" [Ant. VI. 3, 6].

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The *demand* for a *human* kingdom like the kingdom in other nations, and its fulfilment, is one of the most important turning-points in the development of the Kingdom of God under the Old Covenant. Historically *occasioned* by constant danger from without, against which there was no one sufficient leader, and by the arbitrary and illegal procedure of the judges, it was more deeply *grounded* in the *need* (felt by the people and supported by public opinion) of a sole, continuous, and externally and internally firm and energetic rule. And this rule, even if it took the shape of *royalty,* needed not to be in conflict with the monarchical rule of God over His people (Ex. xix. 5 sq.; Judg. viii. 23; 1 Sam. xii. 12); for 1) the human king, if his relation to God's kingdom were rightly apprehended, need be nothing more than the instrument and representative of the *theocratic* kingdom; 2) from the Patriarchal time on, through the Mosaic period and that of the Judges till now, there had been defined hopes of and allusions to the rise of a mighty and glorious kingdom within the nation under the lead of the Divine Spirit Himself (Gen. xvii. 6, 16; xxxv. 11; Numb. xxiv. 17; comp. Deut. xvii. 14-20; Judg. viii. 23, ix. 22; 1 Sam. ii. 10, iii. 35); and 3) the existing government was no longer able to perform the duties incumbent on it. Ew. *Gesch.* [*History of Israel,* 2, 606 sq.]: "As, then, even under Samuel, in his latter years, the judicial office showed itself without and within too weak and unable to give permanent security, the time was at last come when the people must either submit to a more perfect human government, or perish irretrievably." The unfavorable *decision* on the demand given nevertheless by Samuel and in the divine declaration, refers to the sinful *disposition* of mind out of which the demand sprang—a disposition not trusting unconditionally in God's power, anticipating the plans of His wisdom and His chosen time, controlled by vain and proud desire to imitate the royal magnificences of the heathen peoples. "In this there was a two-fold ungodly element. 1) They desired a king instead of the God-established and nobly attested Judge Samuel. . . . . . The scheme is characterized as an injustice against Samuel, and therefore a sin against the Lord, who sent him, vers. 7, 8. 2) At the bottom of the people's desire for a king lay the delusion, that God was powerless to help them, that the reason of their subjection was not their sin, but a fault in the constitution, that the kingdom would be an aid *in addition to* God. This point of view appears oftener in the narrative than the first. Is. x. 18, 19; xii. The kingdom desired in such a mind was not a form of God's kingdom in accordance with revelation, but opposed to His kingdom." (Hengst. *Beit.* 3, p. 256 sq.) Calvin: "They ought to have waited patiently for the time predetermined by God, and not have given place to their own designs and methods apart from God's word. They ought not, therefore, to have anticipated God's purpose, but ought to have waited till the Lord Himself should show by indubitable signs that the foreordained time had come, and should direct their counsels. Moreover, though they recognized Samuel as a prophet, they not only did not inquire of him whether they were to have a king or not, but wanted him to aid in carrying out their design. They do not think of invoking God; they demand that a king be given them; they adduce the customs and institutions of other nations." *Nevertheless,* Samuel yields to the desire of the people, "because he knows that now *God's time* has come; but, at the same time, he does all that he can to bring the people to a consciousness of

* On the doubling of the ל in לֹא see Ew. *Gr.,* § 91 *d.*

their sin." (Hengst. *ib.* 258.) The *fulfilment* of the demand for a human kingdom is distinctly granted by God, because, though as a human factor in the movement it is rooted in sin, yet, foreseen by God, it fits into His plan, and is to be the means of elevating and confirming the Theocracy in His people, and of laying the foundation for the further development of the nation's history, till the preparation should be complete for salvation in the person of Him, of whom the kingdom of Israel in David was to be the prefiguration and type. "Herein the law, which runs through the whole history of the development of revelation, repeats itself: by the guilt of the covenant-people God's arrangements for salvation reach a point where they no longer serve; then their guilt is revealed most strongly in open disobedience to God; but, in permitting what the people sinfully wish, God grasps the reins and directs events to a point, of which the people in their sinful blindness had thought nothing, so that He only the more glorifies Himself by the elevation of His revelation to a higher place." (O. v. Gerlach.)

2. We are not to think of the relation between the theocracy and the kingdom established through Samuel, as if the latter were an addition to the former "to aid it in accomplishing its task, and to supply what was lacking to the times," as if a "mixed constitution and rule" had arisen, and "out of a divine government" had come a "royal-divine government," a Basileo-Theocracy. Ew. *Gesch.* [*Hist.*] 3, 8. This conception of a co-ordinate relation does not agree with the governing principle of the theocracy, that God is and remains king of His people, that God's law and truth is the authority to which the kingdom must unconditionally submit, in dependence on which it is to govern as visible instrument of the theocracy in the name and place of the invisible king. The rejection of Saul, who would not pay unconditional obedience to God's rule, and the divine recognition of David's government as one which was thoroughly in unison with the rule of Israel's true king, their God and Lord, and which continued to prepare the way for its realization in the people, laying the historical basis for the future manifestation of the Messianic kingdom, confirm the view that the relation of the Israelitish kingdom to the Theocracy (as Samuel, under God's direction, founded it) was one of unconditional subordination; it was to be the instrument of the latter. The statement that there was an encroachment on the pure Theocracy in the fact "that Jehovah could no longer be the sole Lawgiver, that the earthly king must execute *his* will with unrestrained authority" (Diestel, *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.*, 1863, p. 554) rests on an incorrect presupposition, since, according to the principle of the Theocracy, even the established monarchy was expressly subject to the legislative authority of the covenant-God, and both king and people must unconditionally conform their will to the will and law of God.

3. This history of the people's desire for a king and its fulfilment by God exhibits the relation of the divine will to the human will, when the latter stands sinfully opposed to the former. God never destroys the freedom of the human will. He leaves it to its free self-determination, but when it has turned away from His will, seeks to bring it back by the revelation in His word. If this does not succeed, human perversity must nevertheless minister to the realization of the plans of His kingdom and salvation, and also, in its evil consequences, bring punishment, according to His righteous law, on the sin which man thus freely commits.

4. Samuel appears, in this crisis of Old Testament history, among the men of God whom the Bible represents as heroes in *prayer*, as Abraham, Moses, Joshua, David, Elijah. Speaking to the people, he represented God as his prophet; praying to God, he represented the people as their priestly mediator. Comp. Schröring, *Samuel als Beter* ("Samuel as a praying man"), in the *Zeitschr. für luth. Theol. u. Krit.*, 1856, p. 414 sq.

5. [The relation between this narrative of the demand for a king and the "law of the king," Deut. xvii. 14-20, requires a brief notice. It seems strange that Samuel, if he was acquainted with this law, makes no mention of it. There is no difficulty in his characterization of the demand as a rejection of the divine rule over them (Jehovah Himself (vers. 7, 8) does the same thing), for the sin was in their feeling and purpose, not in the demand *per se*, as Dr. Erdmann well brings out; and Samuel might have so spoken, if he had known that the Law contemplated the possibility of a regal government. The real difficulty lies in the fact that the narrative in 1 Sam. viii.—xii. seems to be unconscious of the law in Deuteronomy. Allowing much, it might be said, for the simple, unscientific, historical method of the times, in which quotations are rare, and things omitted which are commonly known, it would yet seem that there should be in the addresses of the people, of Samuel, and of Jehovah, some recognition of the fact that this was a thing which did not make its first appearance now, and some reference to the obligations imposed on the king in the Mosaic Law. But, is there no recognition in the later transaction of the earlier law? If we compare the two, we shall find the relation between them to be the following: the form of demand in Deut. xvii. 14 is given almost *verbatim* in 1 Sam. viii. 5, but the former adds "about me," while the latter adds the ground of the desire, "that he may be judicial and military head;" for choice by Jehovah in Deut. (ver. 15), we have choice by the people in 1 Sam. (ver. 18); and by Jehovah (x. 24); the reference to horses is nearly the same in form in both, but in tone quite different, Deut. ver. 16; 1 Sam. viii. 11; on the other hand, the mention of returning to Egypt, of wives, silver and gold, and the study of the law (Deut. vers. 17-20) is not found in Samuel. It will be seen from this comparison, and still more from a comparison of the whole tone and drift in the two, that the act described here was probably performed without reference to the statute in Deut.; that the desire of the people was a natural, historical growth, and the course of events was determined by the circumstances of the time. So in the history of Gideon we see a similar unconsciousness of the Deuteronomic statute (though there is recognition of the theocracy), and a similar determination of action by existing circumstances. Where, then, was the Mosaic law all this time? and was Samuel ignorant of it? The answer to these questions seems to be suggested by the statement in 1 Sam. x. 25, in which there are three distinct affirmations: 1) "that Sa-

muel told the people the law or manner of the kingdom, which is plainly different from the law of the king in chap. viii., and is most naturally to be identified with Deut. xvii. 14-17; 2) that he wrote this law in a book; and 3) that he put it somewhere in safe keeping. It seems probable, therefore, that we have here the *political adoption* of the essence of the Mosaic "law of the king" (which, in its prohibition of a return to Egypt, for example, has the stamp of Mosaic times). The law had been announced by Moses, transmitted through the priests, and was known to Samuel (though perhaps not generally known among the people). But it was a *permission* of royalty merely, not an injunction, and its existence did not diminish the people's sin of superficial, unspiritual longing for outward guidance, nor prove at first to Samuel that the time for its application had come. He therefore says nothing about it. But when the transaction is concluded, the king actually chosen, then he announces the law, and with obvious propriety commits it in its constitutional form to writing, and deposits it before Jehovah as a part of the theocratic constitution. Thus the history seems to become natural and intelligible when regarded as exhibiting Samuel's doubts as to whether the proper time had come for the historical realization of what Moses puts merely as a possibility. Apparently Samuel was not in sympathy with the movement, and seems to have felt after this that he had outlived his time.—TR.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 1–3. STARKE: Even good intentions do not always turn out well, but often fall through. —Upright parents cannot always be blamed for it, if their children turn out badly.—Avarice is a root of all evils, 1 Tim. vi. 9, 10; earnestly to avoid it is a great part of the wisdom of the righteous.—CALVIN: Parents should feel the duty laid upon them, amid great anxiety and sorrow, to pray to God for the prosperity of their children, and with earnest admonitions diligently to hold them to the task of making their life holy. They should earnestly beg God to lead and govern by His Holy Spirit the children whom He has given them, and to let the mercy which has been their own portion pass over to their children also, and to grant them the gift of perseverance and constancy. For if so holy and exalted a prophet was not spared the having such wicked and corrupt sons, how will it be with those who are far removed from his piety.

Vers. 4–6. STARKE: Even good things may sometimes be ill desired. A pious government is greatly pained when it traces among its subjects nothing but mere ingratitude.—CRAMER: When something disagreeable and repugnant befalls us, we can better bring it home to no one than to God; for He consoles the lowly, 2 Cor. vii. 6.—CALVIN: We ought, when anything is done or said against the honor of God, to be aroused and zealous, but not to suffer ourselves to be provoked when in regard to ourselves or ours an injustice is done us.

Vers. 7–9. STARKE: What is done to servants of God, God accepts as done to Himself, Acts ix. 5.—BERLEB. BIBLE: God hears in manifold ways when we cry to Him for human guidance, and then we imagine we have obtained a great favor. But what a great misfortune it is when one draws himself off from the richly instructive guidance of the Lord, to allow Himself to be led by creatures which withdraw us from the guidance of God! Then from freemen, which we formerly were, we become mere bondmen, and can also rightly say, if only we are so happy as to forsake the human guidance: "O Lord our God, other lords beside thee have had dominion over us; but by thee only will we make mention of thy name" (Isa. xxvi. 13). An upright guide like Samuel does not appropriate to himself the souls of men, but guides them to God, and serves only the purpose of bringing them to Him.—WUERTEMB. BIBLE: Old sins are not forgotten with God, if they are all the time kept up, and not repented of (Ex. xxxii. 34).—SCHMID: The fountain of all sins is in not fearing God; and he who fears not to sin against God, also fears not to sin against men.—Ver. 9. SCHMID: If God has cause enough to punish, yet out of His long-suffering He will also have cause enough merely to chide and admonish (Hos. xi. 8, 9).

Vers. 15, 16. BERLEB. BIBLE: If we owe so much to the earthly king, what do we not owe to the heavenly king? O Thou King of Glory, do but come and reign over us! Let Thy kingdom come to us! Lift up your heads, ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in.—[Ver. 18. *Cries that will not be heard:* 1) Self-will often brings us into distress. 2) This distress makes us cry to the Lord. 3) Such cries the Lord does not promise to hear.—TR.]—Ver. 19. SCHMID: Among wretched men there is no constancy save in wickedness (Isa. v. 18).—CALVIN: We learn here how God, according to His righteous judgment, blinds men and gives them up to error, when they persistently go after their foolish and perverse desires. Therefore we ought to learn from this example to be wise, that when we are entangled in sore temptations, we may not give too much room to our own plans and thoughts, as if they rested on a firm foundation and were wholesome. We will beg God to rule us by His Spirit, and not to give us over to ourselves, and not even in the least to suffer us to depart from His Word, but rather work in us that that Word may maintain its dominion over us, and we may rejoice in its guidance.—Ver. 21. STARKE: A Christian should bewail and tell his need to no one rather than to the faithful God, and learn from Him how he shall rightly behave himself.—Ver. 22. S. SCHMID: God's forbearance should not confirm men in wickedness, as if it were well done, but should lead them to repentance, that they may at last recognize their unrighteousness (Ps. l. 21).

II. *Samuel meets Saul and Learns that he is Destined by God to be King over Israel.*

Chapter IX. 1–27.

1 Now [And] there was a man of Benjamin, whose name was Kish, the son of
Abiel, the son of Zeror, the son of Bechorath, the son of Aphiah,[1] [*ins.* the son of[2]]
2 a Benjamite, a mighty man of power.[3] And he had a son whose name was Saul, a
choice young man and a goodly [young and goodly[4]]; and there was not among
the children of Israel a goodlier person than he; from the shoulders and upward
he was higher than any of the people.
3 And the asses[5] of Kish, Saul's father, were lost. And Kish said to Saul, his
4 son, Take now one of the servants with thee, and arise, go seek the asses. And he
passed through[6] mount Ephraim [the hill-country of Ephraim], and passed through
the land of Shalisha, but [and] they found them not, then [and] they passed through
the land of Shalim [Shaalim], and there they were not, and he passed through the
5 land of the Benjamites,[7] but [and] they found them not. *And* [*om.* and] when
they[8] were come to the land of Zuph, Saul said to his servant that was with him,
Come and let us return, lest my father leave *caring* for the asses and take thought
6 for [be anxious about[9]] us. And he said unto [to] him, Behold, now, there is in
this city a man of God,[10] and he is an honorable[11] man [the man is honorable]; all
that he saith cometh surely to pass; now let us go thither; peradventure he can
7 [will] show us our way that we should go.[12] Then said Saul [And Saul said] to his servant,
But, [And] behold, if we go, what shall we bring the man? for the bread is spent
in our vessels, and there is not a present to bring to the man of God; what have
8 we? And the servant answered Saul again and said, Behold, I have here at hand
the fourth part of a shekel of silver, *that* will I give [and I[13] will give it] to the
9 man of God to tell [that he may show] us our way. (Beforetime in Israel, when a
man went to inquire of God, thus he spake, Come and let us go to the seer; for he
10 that is now[14] called a prophet was beforetime called a seer.) Then said Saul [And
Saul said] to his servant, Well said; come, let us go. So [And] they went unto
the city where the man of God was.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. These names are given differently in the Sept. See Exegesis, *in loco*.—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 1. This phrase is a somewhat strange one. The word "son" is found in Heb., Gr., Lat., Chald., omitted in Syr., Arab., and is probably a part of the text; but it is strange that it is not followed by a proper name, and suggests an omission or error in the following words, which, however, cannot now be determined. Before the first "Benjamin" Wellhausen suggests the insertion of "Gibeah of."—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 1. By Erdmann and others rendered "wealth," but not so well. See Exposition.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 2. The word בחור is often used of youth merely, so that the rendering: "choice young man" (Erdmann, *auserlesen*), is hardly warranted. But, as it seems to differ from נער (which is the word here used of the servant) in designating the vigorous time of youth, the phrase might be translated: "in the prime of youth and goodly."—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 3. Properly "she-asses."—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 4. Or: "he passed over into," and so in the other cases.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 4. "The land of Jemini or the Jeminites," no doubt for "Benjaminites," the compound being resolved.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 5. The remarkable variation of grammatical Number here and in ver. 4 has produced various readings in the VSS. and in a few MSS. The Sept. and Vulg. write plural throughout, while Chald., Syr. and Arab. make all the verbs "passed through" Sing., both apparently assimilations for the sake of simplicity. The harder reading of the Heb. is better retained.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 5. The English phrase: "take thought for" (as in Matt. vi. 34), has now lost its sense of trouble and anxiety.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 6. Elohim, without the Art., but here evidently for the true God of Israel. On the supposed difference between the arthrous and anarthrous use of the word, see Quarry on Genesis, and *Bib. Comm. in loco*.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 6. Properly, "honored," "esteemed."—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 6. Perhaps, better: "on which we are going," or: "in respect to which we are going." To "go away" is usually הלך דרך, and על הדרך is "on the side of the way;" in any case, however, the verb (which is a Perf.) is better taken as Pres. or Fut., and not as Past, as Erdmann renders. The VSS. also translate it past.—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 8. Sept.: "thou shalt give," which Wellhausen prefers; Chald., Syr., Vulg., Arab.: "we will give." These are probably variations for the sake of propriety.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 9. Sept.: "for the people (העם for היום) formerly called the prophet the seer," an obvious and unfortunate misreading.—Tr.]

11 *And* [*om.* and] as they went up [were going up[15]] the hill to [on which was[16]]
the city, they found [came upon] young maidens going out to draw water, and said
12 unto them, Is the seer here? And they answered them and said, He is; behold,
he is before you [thee]; make haste,[17] now, for he came to-day[17] to the city, for
13 there is a sacrifice of the people to-day in [on] the high place; As soon as ye be
come into the city, ye shall straightway find him, before he go up to the high place
to eat; for the people will not eat until he come, because he doth bless the sacrifice;
and [*om.* and] afterwards they eat that be bidden. Now therefore [And now] get
14 you up, for [*ins.* he[18]], about this time ye shall find him. And they went up into
[to] the city; *and* [*om.* and] when they were come [As they were going] into the
city, behold, Samuel came out [was coming out] against [towards] them, for [*om.*
15 for] to go up to the high place. Now [And] the Lord [Jehovah] had told Samuel
16 in his ear [had informed Samuel[19]] a day before Saul came, saying, To-morrow,
about this time [About this time to-morrow] I will send thee a man out of the land
of Benjamin, and thou shalt anoint him to be captain [prince] over my people
Israel, that he may [and he shall] save my people out of the hand of the Philistines;
for I have looked upon my people,[20] because their cry is come unto me.
17 And when [*om.* when] Samuel saw Saul, [*ins.* and] the Lord [Jehovah] said unto
[answered] him, Behold the man whom I spake to thee of! this same [the man of
whom I said to thee, he] shall reign over my people.
18 Then [And] Saul drew near to Samuel in the gate,[21] and said, Tell me, I pray
19 thee, where the seer's house is. And Samuel answered Saul, and said, I am the
seer; go up before me unto the high place, for [and] ye shall eat with me to-day,
and to-morrow I will let thee go, and will tell thee all that is in thine heart [and I
20 will let thee go in the morning, and all that is in thy heart I will tell thee]. And
as for thine asses, that were lost three days ago, set not thy mind on them; for they
are found. And on whom is all the desire of Israel [And to whom belongs all
that is desirable[22] in Israel]? is it not on [does it not belong to] thee, and on [to]
21 all thy father's house? And Saul answered and said, Am not I a Benjamite, of
the smallest of the tribes of Israel? and my family the least of all the families of
the tribe[23] of Benjamin? [*ins.* and] wherefore then [*om.* then] speakest thou so to
22 me? And Samuel took Saul and his servant, and brought them into the parlor
[eating-room], and made them sit in the chiefest place among [and gave them a
place at the head of] them that were bidden, which [and they] were about thirty[24]
23 persons. And Samuel said unto [to] the cook, Bring the portion which I gave
24 thee, of which I said unto thee, Set it by thee. And the cook took up the shoulder,
and that which was upon it, and set it before Saul, and *Samuel* [*om.* Samuel,
ins. he[25]] said, Behold that which is left! set it before thee [what was reserved is

[15] [Ver. 11. A peculiar construction (הֵמָּה with Partcp.), which occurs no less than six times in this chapter.—Tr.]

[16] [Ver. 11. Literally: "the ascent of the city."—Tr.]

[17] [Ver. 12. Sept.: "Behold, he is before you, now on account of the day he is come to the city." They therefore attached the first letter of מַהֵר to the preceding word, and omitted the rest, and instead of כִּי הַיּוֹם read כְּהַיּוֹם as in the latter part of the verse. Wellhausen urges the adoption of this second reading on the ground that we thus avoid the statement that Samuel had that very day come to the city from abroad, which seems inconsistent with vers. 23, 24, and says that the "hasten" of the maidens is unintelligible, based, as it is, on the fact that Samuel had just come. The "for," however, must not be pressed; it simply introduces the explanation of the eager maidens, and such usage is frequent in Heb. The other variation of the Sept. commends itself as natural and appropriate: "he has just gone into the city." The Sing. of the address in ver. 12 need not surprise us; the maidens direct their discourse chiefly to Saul, who was evidently the master (the Midrash says, because they were attracted by his beauty).—Tr.]

[18] [Ver. 13. The Heb. inserts an emphatic Accus., which it is desirable to retain in the translation, Eng. idiom, however, requiring the Nom.—Tr.]

[19] [Ver. 15. Literally: "uncovered the ear of Samuel," made a disclosure to him.—Tr.]

[20] [Ver. 16. Sept.: "the affliction of my people," a natural but unnecessary insertion.—Tr.]

[21] [Ver. 18. Instead of "gate" (שַׁעַר), Sept. and one MS. of De Rossi read "city" (עִיר), which suits the connection better.—Tr.]

[22] [Ver. 20. So all ancient VSS. and modern interpreters; Philippson, *wünschenswerth*, Erdmann, *begehrenswerth*, Cahen, *objet désirable*.—Tr.]

[23] [Ver. 21. In the Heb. "tribes," which is generally regarded as an error of copyist, though it might be understood as referring to families, see Num. iv. 18; Judg. xx. 12.—Tr.]

[24] [Ver. 22. Sept. has 70, instead of 30.—Tr.]

[25] [Ver. 24. The subject of the verb may be Samuel or the cook, and, on grammatical grounds, is more probably the latter, into whose mouth the words may be very well put, the "since I said" below not being in the Heb. text. Erdmann holds a different opinion; see Exposition, *in loco*.—Tr.]

set[26] before thee]; *and* [*om.* and] eat, for unto this time hath it been kept for thee
since I said,[27] I have invited the people. So [And] Saul did eat with Samuel that
day.
25 And when they were come [And they came] down from the high place unto [to]
the city, *Samuel* [*om.* Samuel, *ins.* and he] communed [spake] with Saul upon the
26 top of the house [the roof]. And they arose early;[28] and it came to pass about
the spring of the day [at day-dawn] that Samuel called [*ins.* to] Saul to [on] the
top of the house [roof], saying, Up [Rise], that I may [and I will] send thee away.
And Saul arose, and they went out both of them, he and Samuel, abroad [on the
27 street]. *And* [*om.* and] as they were going down to the end of the city, Samuel
said to Saul, Bid the servant pass on before us (and he passed on[29]), but [and]
stand thou still a while, that I may [and I will] show [tell] thee the word of
God.

[26] [Ver. 24. This word (שִׂים) is taken by the ancient VSS. and Eng. A. V. as Impv., but better, with Erdmann, as Partcp.—Tr.]

[27] [Ver. 24. On the text of this obscure passage see Exposition *in loco*.—Tr.]

[28] [Ver. 26. The Sept. text of vers. 25, 26, commends itself by its simplicity and concinnity: "into the city, and they spread (a bed) for Saul on the roof, and he lay down. And it came to pass," *etc.* See discussion in Exposition.—Tr.]

[29] [Ver. 27. This remark is lacking in Sept. Vat. (but not Alex.), Syr. and Arab., and is probably a gloss. The Syriac (as Wellhausen points out) adds a similar remark at end of ver. 3: "and Saul arose and departed, and took with him one of the servants, and departed to seek the asses of his father."—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1, 2. Saul's *family* and *person*.—The statement that Kish was the son of Abiel is opposed to that of 1 Chr. viii. 33; ix. 39, according to which Ner was the father of Kish, but agrees with 1 Sam. xiv. 51, according to which Ner was the father of Abner and the son of Abiel, and therefore the brother of Kish. This difference is not to be set aside by the arbitrary assumption that Ner in Chron. is not the father, but the grandfather, or a still remoter ancestor of Kish (Keil), but the statement in Chron is to be corrected by this and xiv. 51. [Keil's supposition of an omitted name in the list is scarcely "arbitrary," since such omissions are elsewhere found in genealogical records. To construct Saul's genealogy it is natural to compare the various statements in the Scriptures, and attempt to make them accord. Bringing together Gen. xlvi. 2; 1 Sam. ix. 1; xiv. 51; 1 Chr. vii. 6–8; viii. 29–33; ix. 35–39, the following line may be made out: 1. Benjamin. 2. Becher. 3. Aphiah—perhaps same with Abiah. 4. Bechorath. 5. Zeror or Zur. 6. Abiel or Jehiel. 7. Ner. 8. Kish. 9. Saul, in which, however, some links may be omitted, as Matri, mentioned 1 Sam. chap. x. 21. Abner is thus Saul's uncle, as in xiv. 50. If Ehud in 1 Chr. vii. 10 be the judge of that name (Judg. iii.), he was not of the same family with Saul. In 1 Chr. ix. 35 Jehiel, the ancestor of Saul, is said to have been the father, that is, the first settler of Gibeon; but it is uncertain how far back we have to put him. The name "Saul" was borne by others, see Gen. xxxvi. 37, 38, xlvi. 10; 1 Chr. vi. 24; Acts vii. 58. See *Bib. Dicts., s. v.* Ner and Saul, and *Comms.* on "Chronicles."—Tr.]. The phrase גִּבּוֹר חָיִל [Eng. A. V. "a mighty man of power"] here means a rich well-to-do man (Ges., De Wette) and not as in xvi. 18, a strong, valiant man (Vulgate, Cler., Then.); for it undoubtedly refers to *Kish*, who is, indeed, "not represented in the history as *specially* wealthy" (Then.), but is all the more distinctly described as in *easy circumstances* and prosperous. It is intended to state that Saul came from a *substantial* family. This accords much better with the connection than the representation of him as a man of vigor and strength by the statement that his father was a *valiant* man. —The genealogical statement about Saul's descent is followed (ver. 2) by a short description of his *person*. The name *Saul* means the "asked" (comp. Gen. xlvi. 10); "it occurs frequently, and was, probably, usually the name of the desired (asked) *first-born*" (Then.). Saul was a choice and *handsome* man. בָּחוּר is to be rendered electus (Vulg.),* not only because he had a *grown* son (xiii. 1–3), but also because it is expressly said (x. 24) that the Lord elected and chose him, because his like was not to be found in all the people, that is, in respect to his distinguished personal appearance; in spite of the first-mentioned fact, he might else still have ranked as a young man. He excelled all other Israelites both in warlike *beauty* and in *height*, according to the vivid description "from the shoulder upward;" his person was in keeping with the lofty position to which, as ruler over Israel, he was *chosen* by God, as is expressly said in x. 24.†

Vers. 3–10. *The occasion of Saul's meeting with Samuel:* The loss of and search for the asses of Kish.—Ver. 3. Kish's preparations for recovering the lost asses show him to be a substantial and propertied man. His command to his son "take a servant, arise, go, seek," gives a vivid description of what occurred. Vers. 4 sqq. contain a similarly fresh and animated description of Saul's wandering search with his servant. The mention of the *hill-country of Ephraim first* as scene of the search is explained by the fact that these hills stretched from the north down into the territory of Benjamin, and *Gibeah*, Saul's home and start-

* [The rendering "in the prime of youth" (which might be forty years) suits the first of these two facts, and the second cannot be pressed, because the word is often used where this fact does not exist. See Text. and Gram.—Tr.]

† [On the ancient regard for physical greatness, see *Synopsis Crit.;* Kitto, *Daily Bib. Ill.*—Tr.]

ing-point (comp. x. 26; xi. 4; xv. 34; xxiii. 19; xxvi. 1) lay on their slope. The land of *Shalisha*, which they *next* traversed, probably takes its name from שָׁלֹשׁ ["three"], because there three valleys united in one, or one divided into three = *Threeland* (see Then. in Käuffer's *Stud. d. sächs. Geistl.* II., 142); it is the region in which, according to 2 Kings iv. 42, Baalshalisha lay [15 miles north of Diospolis or Lydda.—Tr.]. *Thereupon* they traversed the land of *Shaalim*, according to Then., "perhaps a very deep valley (comp. שֹׁעַל 'the hollow of the hand,' and מִשְׁעוֹל 'a hollow or narrow way'"), probably the region which lay eastward from Shalisha, where on the maps of Robinson and Vandevelde the Beni Mussah and Beni *Salem* are marked (comp. Keil *in loco*).* The next statement that they traversed the land of *Benjamin*, indicates that from Shaalim they go from north-east to south-west. Thence they came into the land of *Zuph*, which, as Keil supposes, lay on the south-west of the tribe-territory of Benjamin, since "Saul and his follower on the return home pass first (x. 2) by the tomb of Rachel, and then come to the border of Benjamin."—[Kitto remarks that Saul's tender regard for his father's feelings (ver. 5) is a favorable indication of character.—Tr.].—Ver. 6. The servant prevents Saul from returning home immediately, pointing out to him the *city* before him standing on an eminence, where they would find the man of God, who would perhaps tell them how they might attain the object of their search. The *way, on which* they came,† is the way on which they now are, that they may find what they are seeking; the seer will now perhaps tell them the direction in which they must go on this way, in order to find the asses. From the connection of the whole history of Samuel the city can be no other than his residence, Ramathaim (or, Ramah) Zophim (ch. i. 1), that is, in the district of Zuph, in the Tribe of Benjamin (Josh. xviii. 25). Keil is wrong in pressing against this general assumption the fact that the servant does not say "here *dwells*," but "here *is*" a man of God, which is plainly far-fetched. Equally forced is his explanation of the answer of the maidens (ver. 12): "He came to-day to the city, for there is a great sacrifice of the people on the high-place," from which he infers that the seer's house was not in the city, but that he had only come thither to the sacrificial feast; their answer rather confirms the former view, since the question "is the seer *here*?" referred to the *city*, while the place of offering was on the eminence behind the city, where Samuel in those days worked and dwelt. Samuel has his *residence* in this city (comp. ver. 25 with ver. 18); Keil's supposition of a temporary residence, which he occupied during his presence at the festival, is wholly untenable. As Samuel had built an altar to the Lord at Ramah (vii. 17), it is more natural to think of this residence of Samuel than of any other place, the name of which would no doubt otherwise have been given. Finally, it is to be added that Samuel is known to the servant, and the latter knows that he is here. On the other supposition, how should he know that Samuel was here precisely at this time, if it was not his residence? [These arguments are replied to in various ways by expositors who hold that this city was not Ramah. But Erdmann is undoubtedly right in saying that the impression made by this narrative is that it was Samuel's residence to which Saul came. The difficulty lies in reconciling this statement with the itinerary in ch. x. 2–5. See the exposition and translator's note on ch. i. 1. As Rachel's tomb was near Bethlehem, and Saul was going towards Bethel, one would suppose the city in ch. ix. to be south or south-west from Bethlehem, that is, not in the territory of Benjamin at all. And if it was not Ramah it is impossible to say what it was.—It is worthy of note that Saul seems to know nothing about Samuel; it is the servant that knows and does everything. Saul rather appears as a simple-minded rustic youth, who has rarely left his pastoral occupations, and knows little of the political and religious elements of the time.—Tr.].—From this passage it appears (comp. ver. 9) that the earliest prophets were consulted by the people about ordinary matters of life, of which they were looked on as having superior knowledge. It is, however, undetermined, whether Samuel would have answered the question about the asses, if the loss of and search for them had not been, according to the revelation made him from above, the divinely-appointed means for bringing him into connection with the person of the designated king.

Vers. 7, 8. Those who went to question the prophets carried them *presents* (comp. 1 Kings xiv. 3). These are in the first place to be regarded as *honorary* gifts, intended to show respect. But this does not exclude the supposition that they depended for support on these voluntary gifts offered in return for information desired. Saul fears that he has no gift worthy of the man, but the servant, who is drawn to the life, is ready with the reply: "There *is* in my hand (I have here *at hand*) the *fourth* of a *shekel of silver*" (called *zuz* (זוּז) by the later Jews, see Targ. Jon. *in loc.*). The silver-shekel and its parts (½, ⅓, ¼), are not pieces *weighed* in transference, but already of determined weight and value, coins "current with the merchant" (Gen. xxiii. 16), which were "counted." The Shekel was in German money about 26 *silbergroschen*, the quarter, therefore, about 6½ *silbergroschen*. [There is no means of determining precisely the value of the shekel in Samuel's time. In our Lord's time a stater = shekel seems to have been about 70 cents United States currency, and a quarter about 18 (equivalent perhaps to two dollars now). A German Silbergroschen is about 2½ cents in our currency. There is no evidence that coined money existed in Israel before the captivity, and the first native coins were probably struck some centuries after the Return.—Tr.]. The *Preterites* give an admirably true picture of the animated manner of the servant, who is intent only on the object of their search, and willingly makes the sacrifice of the money for the asses.—Ver. 9. "The man" (הָאִישׁ) is the indef. subject (Germ. *man* [Eng. *one*]), though the *Art.* makes the individual personality more prominent. Ew. *Gr.* § 294 *d*. An express difference is made here between the ancient designation of the

* [Others render "jackal-land," and refer to Shual (1 Sam. xiii. 17), or Shaalbim (Judg. i. 35) in the territory of Dan. The geography is altogether uncertain.—Tr.]

† [On the rendering see Textual and Grammat.—Tr.]

prophet *Roeh* (רֹאֶה), for which later in the solemn, poetic language the synonymous *Chozeh* (חֹזֶה "gazer") was used, and the term in use in the author's time *Nabi* (נָבִיא). The former (Roeh, seer), points only to the form in which "the insight" into what was hidden came to them, the latter (Nabi), on the contrary, "to the source of the divinatory insight, to God" (Tholuck, *Die Propheten*, p. 21). The remark in ver. 9 belongs according to its content to ver. 11.

[*Note on Roeh.*—The statement in ver. 9 has special interest in connection with the history of prophetic work in Israel. The three terms named above have each its peculiar meaning and its special use, though to a certain extent employed interchangeably. Besides in this chapter, *Roeh* occurs three times of Samuel (1 Chron. ix. 22; xxvi. 28; xxix. 29), twice of Hanani (2 Chron. xvi. 9, 10), once with a general application (Isa. xxx. 10), and once apparently of Zadok the priest in a passage (2 Sam. xv. 27) where the text is somewhat involved in suspicion; it is used, that is, *c.* B. C. 1100–700. *Chozeh* is found in 2 Sam., in the prophets, and in Chron., about B. C. 800–400. *Nabi* occurs from Gen. to Mal., in nearly every book of the Old Testament. As to the meaning, *Nabi* is clearly one who speaks for God (see the general meaning in Ex. vii. 1), announcing or representing His will by His command. *Chozeh*, the "gazer," is one who sees visions of God; the verb, where it means "behold," is used only in poetry, and always of divine visions, and the noun was employed as synonymous with Nabi, meaning prophet in the fullest sense. So, too, *Roeh* the "seer," in the one passage (Isa. xxx. 10) where it occurs with a general application, is used as synonymous with Chozeh, while our verse here affirms the substantial identity of Roeh and Nabi. But, as the Nabi always claims inspiration, whether he be true or false, we must regard the Roeh also as an inspired person. Dr. R. Payne Smith ("*Prophecy a prep. for Christ*," Lect. II.) holds that the Roeh was simply a man of acute understanding, uninspired, to whom the people were in the habit of resorting for advice in difficult matters. He bases his view chiefly on this chapter, and especially on the Sept. reading of ver. 9: "the *people* called Roeh him," *etc.*, a reading which can hardly be sustained; and, for the reasons given above, it seems necessary to regard the Roeh as inspired. The change of name from Roeh to Nabi and Chozeh had its ground probably in the development of the religious constitution. Up to some time before the author of "Samuel" wrote, the non-sacerdotal, non-Levitical religious teacher was one distinguished by seeing visions, or by seeing into the will of God. This is God's definition of the prophet in Num. xii. 6; it is involved in 1 Sam. iii. 1, 15, and in the visions of the patriarchs. The Law of Moses was the complete and sufficient guide for life and worship, and it was only in special individual matters that the divine direction was given, and then it was through the medium of a vision. He who saw the vision was a Roeh, and it was natural enough that he should be consulted by the people about many matters. But in process of time the mechanicalness and deadness to which the legal ritual constantly tended called forth an order of men who expounded and enforced the spirituality of the Law, speaking as God bade them, speaking for God, entering as a prominent element into the religious life of the nation. He who thus spake was a *Nabi*, and, as he too might have visions, he was sometimes called Chozeh "the gazer" (the verb חזה is not necessarily always to "gaze" as Dr. Smith maintains (*ubi sup.*), as, for ex., in Prov. xxii. 29, but is the poetic conception "behold" as distinguished from "see," though in the visional use it is appropriately rendered "gaze"). As this speaker for God gradually took the place of the old seer of visions, the word Nabi replaced Roeh in popular usage. It seems that the change began in or about Samuel's time, and was completed about three centuries later, Roeh still maintaining itself in the language, though rarely used. On the other hand, Nabi may have been used infrequently in early times, in reference to Abraham and Moses, and have become afterwards the common term, or the occurrence of the word in the Pentateuch may be the transference of a late word to earlier scenes.—Tr.]

Vers. 11–14. *The announcement of the "Seer"* (הֵמָּה עֹלִים, *Just* as they were going up . . . *then* (וְהֵמָּה); the Partcp. with preceding subject denotes a circumstance or fact, synchronously with which or at the occurrence of which another fact or circumstance takes place, which is introduced by וְ before the subject (Ew., *Gr.*, § 341 *d*). A similar construction with הנה . . . והנה follows in ver. 14 and ver. 27).—The word "here" (בָּזֶה) refers to the city, which was on an eminence, since they met the water-drawers as they were *going up*. The answer of the maidens (ver. 12) "*before thee*" is a "direction to go simply straightforward" (Bunsen). Here too the description is very lively, answering perfectly to the peculiarities of the persons. "He came into the city" presupposes either that his residence was without it, or that he had been absent from it some time (Then.). The "*height*" on which the offering took place must be distinguished from the *height* on which the city stood. The name Ramathaim* [= the two Ramahs, or heights] refers to those *two* heights. The *Bamah*, high-place (comp. Mic. iii. 12, where it is synonymous with הַר "mountain," and Mic. i. 3, 4; Jer. xxvi. 18 with Am. iv. 1) is the sacred place of sacrifice on the mountain which rose still higher than the city (comp. ver. 11 with vers. 13, 25, 27). Of such "Bamoth," holy places on heights, where the people assembled for sacrifice and prayer, there were several during the unquiet times of the Judges, especially after the central Sanctuary at Shiloh ceased to exist, till the building of the Temple (comp. vii. 9; x. 8; xiii. 8 sq.; xvi. 2, 3; 1 Kings iii. 2 sq.), as indeed the Patriarchs sacrificed on high places (Gen. xii. 8). It was not till after the building of the Temple that the high-place-worship, which easily degenerated into idolatry (wherefore the Law forbade sacrifice except in Jehovah's dwelling, the Sanctuary) was completely done away with (2 Kings xxiii. 4–23).—In ver. 13 כֵּן corresponds to כְּ, both expressing identity of *time*, or the concurrence of the acts of

* [As to the city see Exposition on ver. 6 and Translator's note.—Tr.]

coming and finding = "as . . . . forthwith," or "when . . . . straightway." Ew. *Gram.* § 360 *b.* —The seer is just going to a sacrificial meal on the high-place. The "people" await him there. A large assembly is therefore gathered to-day on the high-place for a thank-offering. בֵּרֵךְ here = *εὐλογεῖν, εὐχαριστεῖν* ["bless," "give thanks"]. The "him" is repeated in this animated discourse, because the somewhat garrulous and circumstantial women wish to bring the chief person prominently before the inquirer.* "*They that are bidden*" are those whom Samuel had invited to this sacrificial meal, comp. ver. 24.—Ver. 14. The course of events now, according to the very precise and detailed account of the narrator, is as follows: First Saul and his servant go up to the city. Pursuant to the directions of the maidens they pass quickly in. The curt, rapid character of the narration corresponds to the movement. Next, they are already in the midst of the city, when, this is the third fact, Samuel, going out of the city, meets them; they meet in the middle of the city, he going outward toward the high-place, they going inward. That they had gone through the gate was a matter of course and did not require mention. And the statement of ver. 18: "And Saul *drew near* to Samuel *in the midst of the gate*," or, stepped up to him, the fourth fact, need not be regarded as *contradictory* to the preceding statement: "in the midst of the city;" for, from these two statements it is clear that Saul did not go up to Samuel as soon as he met him, as appears also from ver. 17, where it is expressly said what intervened: Samuel saw Saul, and received from God the disclosure that this was the man in reference to whom He had before made a revelation to him. We must therefore suppose a pause between the meeting in the city and the talk in the gate, during which Saul followed Samuel till he approached him in the gate. Thus there is no need for the conjecture that the verse read originally "gate" instead of "city" (Then.), nor the supposition that the narrator was guilty of carelessness (Reuss), nor the artificial, unclear explanation that the words mean "to go into the city, enter, and the entrance was through the gate" (Keil). Ewald's remark that, since Ramah, Samuel's city, was certainly not large, "in the midst of the city" (ver. 4) is not very different from "in the midst of the gate" (ver. 18), comes in excellently, in the sense that the distance between the middle of the city and the middle of the gate was small, to explain satisfactorily why Saul, after the meeting in the city, did not approach Samuel to speak to him till he was in the middle of the gate. Further it is to be noted that conversation and consultation were usually held "in the gate," not on the street, and the pause which Saul's question supposes Samuel to have made could properly occur only in the place set aside for public interviews.

Vers. 15–17. The revelation which Samuel received the day before Saul's arrival, that a man of Benjamin would come to him, whom he was to anoint prince over Israel, was psychologically based on his constant prayerful expectant reflection as to how God would establish the monarchy promised to the people. "*To uncover the ear*" when said of God, signifies, as in 2 Sam. vii. 27, the divine Spirit's announcement to the human spirit, the inbreathing of divine thoughts from above through the word.—**I will send to thee,** (ver. 16): The "I will send" sets forth the divine providence, which so guides the ways of Saul, the chosen king, that he must come to Samuel, the head of Israel and mediator between God and his people. Clericus: "I will take care that he come to thee. For Saul was ignorant of the whole matter, and, while vainly seeking asses, found an unexpected kingdom." The future king came from the *most warlike* tribe, and this revelation to Samuel declares that his *mission* was a warlike one, the deliverance, namely, of Israel from the domination of the Philistines. Israel's victory over the Philistines (vii. 13) was not followed by a complete liberation of land and people from these enemies; rather the words: "The hand of the Lord was against the Philistines all the days of Samuel" point to repeated successful battles against them. It was these that Saul fought, and Samuel survived during the greater part of his reign. Comp. the remarks on vii. 13. "I have looked upon my people" means not "I have had regard to their prayers" (Cleric.), but, as in Ex. ii. 25, in reference to the Egyptian bondage, which was the type of every oppression of Israel by external means, that God, ever present to help His people, had a compassionate knowledge of their needs and misery. The insertion of the Sept. of the words "affliction of," before "my people," is a correct explanation, but not necessary as a part of the original text; for the following words: "their cry is come to me" explain sufficiently in what sense God's *seeing*, to which the *hearing* of the people's cry corresponds, is to be understood. —Ver. 17. At the moment when Samuel saw Saul, he received by divine revelation the inward assurance that this man was the king chosen by God. The phrase "answered" refers to the question which Samuel internally asked God when he saw Saul, whether this was the Benjamite of whom he had been divinely told the day before. The word "bind, restrain" (יַעְצֹר) characterizes his government as a sharp and strict one, as a *coercere imperio.* To this mental experience of Samuel's corresponded the short interval between his passage to the gate and Saul's approach to him in the gate with the question about the seer.

Vers. 18–27. *Saul Samuel's guest, and the latter's talk with him.* Vers. 18 takes up the thread from ver. 14, after the parenthesis, ver. 17. In reply to Saul's question as to the seer's house, Samuel announces himself (ver. 19) as the "seer." The direction: "go up before me" is a mark of respect, like the invitation to take the chief place (ver. 22), and the selection of the best portion at the meal (ver. 24). **Ye shall eat with me to-day** includes the servant, while the courtesy could only be meant for Saul as the master. **All that is in thy heart I will tell thee**—not: "whatsoever thou shalt desire" (Cleric.) in reference to the object of his coming; for in respect to the asses he gives him information immediately (ver. 20), but Samuel will reveal to him his innermost thoughts (Bunsen). He speaks to him as prophet, and prepares him for what he has to communicate to him as prophet. Thenius' reference of the words to what Saul does in chap. xiii., as if he

* [On this verse see "Text. and Grammat."—Tr.]

had "long had it in mind," seems too particular for the general connection here. The reference is rather to the powers and impulses of an aspiring soul, which lay latent in Saul, and fitted him for his destined calling, as well as to his sinful nature, which, by opposing God, might prove a hindrance. In ver. 20 Samuel says two things, by which he showed Saul that he was a prophet. *First*, he announces to him that the ground of anxiety for the asses is already removed.—**Which were lost to-day three days**, that is, "to-day is the third day," day before yesterday, see Ew., Gr., ? 287, *k* [Ges., Gr., ? 118, 2].—**Set not thy mind on them** stands over against the preceding "what is in thy heart." From now on his heart is to claim and accomplish something higher. To this Samuel's *second expression* refers, which hints indistinctly at the great and noble destiny to which God has elected him, in order to awaken and call out what was hidden in his heart. *All the desire* (כָּל־חֶמְדַּת י׳), *omnis cupiditas, omne desiderium Israelis*, but in the objective sense: everything worthy of desire, valuable, *optima quæque* (Vulg.). This signifies, in contrast with the sought and found asses, that noblest possession, which pertained to all Israel, and was destined for him and his father's house, was to be his, unsought and undesired: the royal dignity. Samuel "draws him away from caring about the asses, and first lifts him up to high thoughts and hopes" (O. v. Gerlach). Samuel's obscure, enigmatic words only give him a glimpse of something great and lofty pertaining to himself and his house, and give occasion (ver. 21) to a *disclamatory reply*, which exhibits that which is now in his heart, namely, humility and modesty. The supposition that Saul "well understood that Samuel spoke of the honor of the kingdom" (Dächsel) does not accord with the purposely general and indefinite character of Samuel's words. It is without support from the connection and inconsistent with x. 20, 21, to explain Saul's answer—that the best thing in Israel could not belong to him and his house, because his tribe was the smallest in Israel, and his family the least in this tribe—in reference to his later very different bearing, as "pretended modesty" (Then.). Saul came only afterwards to be untrue to this disposition of mind, which was the condition of his election. (Instead of the obviously erroneous plural, שִׁבְטֵי, "tribes," read sing., "tribe"). The warlike tribe of Benjamin, one of the smallest already in the census of Num. i. 36 sq., had been reduced by the frightful execution recorded in Judg. xx. 20 to an inconsiderable power. The consciousness of this fact is expressed in Saul's words. Looking at his tribe and family, he will not presume to claim so high a consideration as the seer has intimated. Samuel makes him no answer. "He wishes to awaken in him astonishment, expectation, hope" (O. v. Gerlach).—Vers. 22–24 now relate how *Samuel entertains him as an honored guest at the sacrificial meal.*—Ver. 22. A select number of thirty men of note were invited to this festival, and had taken their places in the room (לִשְׁכָּה) provided for the purpose. The *uppermost place*, as the place of honor, is assigned to Saul and his companion. All the people could not be in the room, but held the feast in the open air. Samuel (ver. 23) orders the reserved piece of the meat, as the best, to be set before them. This is more exactly described in ver. 24 as the thigh or shoulder, and "what was *on it*" [attached to it] (הֶעָלֶיהָ, Art. with Rel. force), not "what was *over it*," the broth with which the meat was eaten (Maur.). That which was attached to it was *the best* of the flesh of the offered animals; whether the fat on it, not used in the offering, or the flesh near the shoulder, cannot be determined; it could not be the kidneys (Then., Bunsen), for they, with the attached fat (אֲשֶׁר עֲלֵהֶן), were burned in the slain-offering (Lev. iii. 4). It was probably the *right** leg, which Samuel, as priest, had ordered to be reserved; for it belonged to the priest, according to the Law, Lev. vii. 32 sqq.—"The resemblance to Gen. xlii. 34 is rather from the facts themselves, not from an imitation of one passage by the other." Ew. *Gesch.* III. 29, Rem. 3.—The minute description of the cook's procedure is worthy of note: "and the cook took up," *etc.*, corresponding to the precise account of Samuel's conduct as host. The insertion of "Samuel to Saul" (Sept.), or "Samuel" (Vulg.), after "and he said," is not necessary (Then.), for, considering ver. 23 and the first sentence of ver. 24 as a parenthesis (like vers. 15–17), the "and he said" continues the principal matter, the speech of Samuel. The following words so obviously suit Samuel and not the cook, that a misunderstanding was impossible.† Here also the translation of the Sept. is explicative. שִׂים [Eng. A. V. "set"] is not Imper., but Pas. Partcp. (as in Obad. 4; Num. xxiv. 21). For the construction see Ew., *Gr.*, ? 149 sq., Böttcher, *Neue Æhrenlese in loco*. As to the occurrence, the latter properly remarks that Saul could not be bidden to do what the cook had already just done (וַיָּשֶׂם). Render: "behold, the reserved piece is set before thee." The following words, in which Samuel invites Saul to eat, present great difficulties in the text.—[The literal rendering is: "eat, for at (or unto) the time (or festival) it was preserved for thee, saying (this is the word which makes the grammatical difficulty), the people I have invited."—Tr.] The translation: "for it is kept for thee for the time when I said, I have invited the people," is unclear (De Wette, Keil), and labors under the rendering "when I said" for לֵאמֹר ["saying"]. Thenius (following the Sept., and reading לְצָפַּת for לֵאמֹר, and קְרָץ־נָא for קָרָאתִי) renders: "it has been kept for thee for a sign with (or, in reference to) the people (namely, that thou from now on will be the first), fall to (that is, begin);" against which Böttcher shows that מוֹעֵד cannot mean *sign*, and that this conjectured text is untenable (p. 114 *in loco*). But Böttcher's own view is equally untenable: he holds that an Accus. Pron. has fallen out (for קָרָאתִי stood originally

* [Others suppose that it was not the right shoulder, because Samuel was *not* a priest.—Tr.]

† [Others think it equally clear that these words were spoken by the cook.—Tr.]

־תֶךָ or ־תָיו), and renders: "eat, for to the end (or for the time) it has been kept for thee, that the people might say (think), *I have invited thee* (*or him*)." But the people knew without this that he had invited this guest; no special indication of the invitation was needed, and the reserved portion would rather suggest a reference to the distinction thus conferred on Saul, as Thenius rightly remarks. Thenius further supposes that the original reading may have been "invited him" (קְרָאוּהוּ), and renders: "to this end it is kept for thee, in order (thereby) to say, the people have invited him," that is, he came in accordance with the general desire as honored guest, as chief person. But for this sense there is no historical authority; for the reservation of the portion of honor had nothing to do with an invitation of Saul by the people, and this invitation was in fact given by Samuel alone. Ewald (*ubi sup.*, p. 29, Rem. 3)* renders: "for a sign that thou wast invited before the rest of the people (ver. 22), or that thou art marked out from the rest of the people," which gives no clear sense. Bunsen retains the masoretic text, and translates: "the chief portion was kept for thee to this time; the meal was in fact arranged in honor of thee, as chief person, though I said, the people of the place shall be guests," but himself admits that this is somewhat forced. "Though I said" is still less possible as translation of לֵאמֹר than "when I said." All the difficulties centre in this word. If a corruption of the text is to be supposed, it seems best to adopt Haug's reading (see in Bunsen) לַאֲשֶׁר, and translate: "it was kept for thee for the feast, or festive gathering, to which I invited the people." Luther: "for it was reserved for thee just at this time when I invited the people." The sense of Samuel's words is, that he knew by divine revelation (vers. 15, 16) that he would come. He sees a divine providence in Saul's coming just at this time. In accordance with the intimation which he had received from above, he showed honor not merely to the guest as such, but to him whom God had chosen king of Israel, for such Samuel by the divine instruction had recognized him to be (ver. 17). [As it stands, the Heb. of this clause does not admit of translation, the vss. do not suggest a satisfactory reading (Chald. follows Heb. literally, and Syr. omits the words "saying, I have invited the people"), and the emendations proposed are all unsatisfactory. Yet the purpose seems clearly to be to inform Saul that this was not a chance-piece that was offered him, but one that had been set aside for him when the feast was prepared. This at once showed the intention to confer honor on Saul, and exhibited the prophetic foresight of Samuel.—Tr.].

Vers. 25-27. *Samuel's secret conversation with Saul.* This took place, according to the narrative, on two occasions, and its purpose was, as the context shows, to prepare Saul for the important announcement that God had chosen him to be king, and for its confirmation by the act of anointing. Ver. 25. After the return from the feast on the height, Samuel receives Saul into his house. **He spoke with Saul on the roof.**—There is no ground for adopting (with Then. and Ew.) the text of the Sept.:* "and they prepared (indef. subj.) Saul a bed on the roof, and he lay down." To the Heb. text (which is supported by Chald., Syr. Arab., and Jerome) the Vulgate makes an addition "probably from the Itala" (Keil): "Saul spread a bed on the roof and slept." This is a circumstantial description of what was self-evident from the connection (see ver. 26). Our text, on the contrary, furnishes simply the fact, the mention of which is of great importance for the pragmatical connection of the events related. The unmentioned subject-matter of the talk is not the election of Saul to be king (according to ver. 27). Thenius, wrongly assuming this to be the subject-matter, regards this talk as premature. Samuel prepared Saul for the important communication which he had to make to him, having already before the feast given him an indefinite hint (ver. 20) of the honor that awaited him. This conversation (ver. 25) is the *connecting link* between that on the height and the communication which Samuel made to Saul the following morning. The flat *roof*, arranged so that stay on it was safe (Deut. xxii. 8), was the place to which people withdrew for quiet contemplation, prayer, undisturbed conversation and rest, and where also a guest-chamber was arranged, the place of honor of the house, comp. 1 Kings xvii. 19 with 2 Kings iv. 10. There Saul slept (ver. 26). The conversation which Samuel there held with Saul, probably at the close of the day, referred, as Otto von Gerlach well remarks, "not to the royal dignity, but surely to the deep religious and political decline of the people of God, the opposition of the heathen, the causes of the impotency to oppose these enemies, the necessity of a religious change in the people, and of a leader thoroughly obedient to the Lord."—Ver. 26. **And they arose early**—each from his bed. What follows is a different thing from this—for the words: **And when the morning dawned,** *etc.* state not the rising from sleep, but the getting up and getting ready to depart; they are neither an exacter definition of "and they rose early," as Keil thinks, who renders: "And they arose early in the morning—*namely*, at day-dawn," nor is it a "singular mode of narration" (as Thenius says) to write first "they arose early," and then "when the day dawned," as if we could not suppose that they rose before the dawn, especially after so exciting a conversation the preceding evening and night, and as if Samuel's call to Saul, "rise," were not more naturally to be understood of preparation for the journey than of rising from sleep. That they are to be so taken is evident from the following words, "that I may send thee away," from Samuel's calling to Saul up on the roof, and from the words, "and he *arose*, and they both went out" (on the street).† [In spite of Dr. Erdmann's ingenious

* [כִּי מִשְּׁאָר הָעָם קָרָאתָ! or קְרָצְתָּ.—Tr.]

* Writing וַיְרַבְּדוּ לְשָׁאוּל instead of וַיְדַבֵּר, and closing ver. 25 with וַיִּשְׁכַּב [instead of וַיַּשְׁכִּמוּ in ver. 26—Tr.]

† There is no need to substitute the Qeri הַגָּגָה for the Kethib גָּגָה. Böttcher: "The Accusative-vowel *a*, like the case-vowel *i*, is often without any literal sign" [*mater lectionis*].

defence of the Heb. text, the reading of the Sept. has much to recommend it. It accords better with the character of Hebrew historical narration (which delights in detailing self-evident circumstances), agrees better with the simple, objective nature of the transaction between Samuel and Saul (a protracted political and religious conversation between the two men hardly suits Saul's character, as far as we know it), and removes the somewhat difficult necessity of supposing that they rose before the dawn. (If this had occurred, the Heb. would hardly have failed to mention it; nor is it quite natural to think of the rustic youth Saul, wearied with the walk and the ceremony of the day, as so excited by a general conversation (in which, according to Erdmann and ver. 27, nothing was said of his elevation to the throne) as to be unable to sleep his accustomed time, and so rising before the dawn—some time before, it would seem—and remaining on the roof till he is called, how employed, it is not said). On the other hand, the reading of the Sept. gives a simple and natural narrative: "and a bed was spread for Saul on the roof, and he lay down, and it came to pass when the morning dawned," *etc.;* and whatever conversation was proper under the circumstances may be understood. Throughout the narrative is occupied with objective facts, and not with interior psychological descriptions, as we should expect in a modern work. Thus not a word is said of Samuel's labors among the people preceding the great popular movement in chap. vii.; nor is he elsewhere ever said to have had private conversations with his sons, with Saul, or with David. He may have had these, but it is not the manner of the narrative to mention them. —Tr.]—Ver. 27. As a mark of honor, Samuel accompanies Saul, and, when they reached the extremity of the city, directs him to send the servant on, in order that he might be alone with him, and impart to him in confidential conversation what the Lord had revealed concerning his appointment to be king of Israel. **That I may show thee the word of God.**—Up to this time he had said nothing to him of his choice as king. The declaration "I will show thee" is not to be understood (with Dächsel) as the "factual fulfilment" of that word, but as the introduction and announcement of its content. It is not related what Samuel said to Saul, since that is evident from the immediately following fact, the anointing of Saul. The whole ninth chapter sets forth the preparation of Saul for this communication and anointing, which were at first meant for *him alone*, and confirmed to him his call to be king of Israel. In regard to the preceding conversations, Calvin remarks: God is said to have instructed Saul in good time, so that when he came to the throne he might not be ignorant of his duties, but yet to have trained him gradually, and indeed (a point worthy of attention) not openly, but, as it were, in secret."

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The *preparations* (in ch. ix.) for carrying out the divine decision in reference to the *kingdom* of Israel to be established exhibit the *prophetic office*, represented by *Samuel*, as here also the immediate *organ of God*, to execute God's positive command: "make them a king." In Samuel's person and in his conduct and discourse towards Saul is concentrated the combination of two factors: divine revelation, which lays hold immediately of the general history of Israel as well as of the little affairs of an unknown family, and the earthly-human factor, which shows itself in apparently accidental and trivial occurrences; but at the same time is exhibited the *absolute* control of the divine providence, which, independently of human-earthly views and relations, employing apparently unimportant human accidents and trivial occurrences, yet, to secure the highest ends of God's kingdom, advances firmly and securely, though by circuitous ways, to the appointed goal. And this goal is the realization of the theocracy in a new form, in the form of the kingdom, which was based on the essential character of the theocracy and the character of the times, though it was sinfully demanded by the people out of envy of the splendor of royalty among the heathen, and dissatisfaction with the invisible glory of Jehovah's kingdom.

2. The choice of Saul to be king, and the circumstances which prepared the way for his consecration and anointing, as well as his meeting with Samuel, constitute a *divine act* which enters immediately into the history of Israel, in which we must recognize: 1) The *condescension of God*, both to human weakness and sin (which, as in the sinful longing after a king, must subserve the plans of His providence), and also to the seemingly smallest and most unimportant events of human life, which, as here the lost asses and Saul's search after them, must be the foil to set off His providential government and the accomplishment of His purposes. Without meaning to set forth a mechanical theory of inspiration, we may exclaim with Hamann: "How has God the Holy Ghost stooped, to become a historian of the smallest, most contemptible affairs on earth, in order to reveal to man, in his own language, in his own business, in his own ways, the purposes, the secrets, and the ways of the Deity!" 2) The *independence* of *earthly* and *human relations* in God's counsel and deed, shown in the fact that not a notable man of a prominent family was chosen for this high calling, but an unknown man, "from the smallest family of the smallest of the tribes" (ix. 21) without His knowledge or desire. 3) *God's free grace* is *not conditioned* on *human conduct*. Calvin: "Only by a special exhibition of divine grace did Saul come to this high dignity. By choosing him from the smallest and most insignificant tribe, God purposed to glorify His grace, and exclude *all* appearance of *human coöperation*." Ewald: "Qualified for the royal office, he does not seek to obtain it; for a great good, gained by artful effort of one-sided human grasping, can never become a true one. And so it is a charming history—how Saul, sent to seek the lost asses, after a long and vain search, comes, on the third day, almost against his will, to Samuel, whom he scarcely knew, to ask him about them, and instead of them to receive from him a kingdom. For He, who purposes just at this time to establish the kingdom in Israel, has already chosen him before he knows it." (*Gesch.* III. 27, 28.) 4) The *wisdom* of the divine providence, which so guides and orders what seems to be accidental and trivial, that it is

subservient to His ends, and procures their accomplishment. Calvin: "What seems to our reason accident, God makes into a sign that the seemingly fortuitous is to be referred to the admirable plans of His providence, and is ruled and guided by God's hand, though against this our thoughts protest. Saul wanders uncertainly around, and thinks only how he shall find the asses; meantime, Divine Providence, which had already determined and revealed to Samuel his lot, does not sleep. So all these incidents and wanderings were only preparations and mediate causes by which God accomplished His design concerning Saul. By God's ordainment the asses were lost, that Saul, in seeking them, might find Samuel; God guided the tongue of his father when He commanded him to go in search of the asses; it was God's providence that directed the steps of Saul and his servants, as they went from one place to another, in order to bring them to Samuel."

3. The *conditions* under which alone the *theocratic king* as such could hold and exercise his office in Israel, as typically set forth in Saul's elevation to the throne, were: 1) *natural*, in respect to his *person*, which must be such, in body and soul, as worthily to sustain the royal office; 2) *supernatural*, namely, *divine choice* and equipment; "to the man, feeble in himself, the grace and predestination of God comes to help him with its complete strength for this highest of all callings, to complete him, with the required divine power and holy consecration of mind, into that for which he was naturally endowed" (Ewald); 3) *historical*, confirmatory *signs;* these are partly signs given by God in definite occurrences, which attest the royal call to the people, partly the man's own deeds, which accord with and confirm the royal call; 4) *ethical*, absolute dependence on the divine will in all thought, word and action; the king must "never forget the beginning from which he sprang, and so must always remember that another, the Eternal King, is still above him,—and that any earthly king can be a king after the heart of the King of all kings only so far as he works together with God, and therefore with all spiritual truths." (Ew. *Gesch.* III. 25.) To this fourth condition Samuel's words referred: "All that is in thy heart I will show thee." See Exposition.

4. The account of *Samuel's conduct in this stadium of the preparation for the establishment of the kingdom in the person of Saul* characterizes the prophet: 1) in his *position towards God* in respect to this beginning of a new phase of development of the theocracy: by direct enlightenment of the divine Spirit it is revealed to him *that* the king of Israel has already been chosen by God (vers. 15, 16), *who* is chosen (ver. 17), and *what* he has to announce to him in God's name (ver. 27); 2) in his *conduct as organ of God* towards the designated king, Saul, and in him towards the kingdom: he gradually prepares his mind for the revelation concerning his future calling which he has to make to him in God's name; through the divine enlightenment he is able not only to instruct him as to his lofty mission and position in Israel, but also, by means of his intensified presaging-faculty, to deliver him from the lower earthly care which filled his heart; this declaration about the recovered asses is not merely an example "of accidental predictions, where the presaging-faculty, disjoined from its ethical aim, becomes subservient to the subjective interest" (Tholuck, *Die Propheten*, 2d ed., p. 14), but is an element in the whole organism of this first prophetic history of the Old Testament—an element which is determined by the divine purpose in Samuel's communication to Saul respecting "the most precious in Israel" which was to be his; by this communication Saul's soul was to be lifted up into the presence of his God, that in His light he might see the glory of his theocratic calling; to lead him to this point, Samuel must free his soul from the burden of care for the beasts, and release him from his duty in respect to them; the certainty that the asses were found (divinely revealed to Samuel) gave Saul the inward freeness and receptivity which he needed in order to advance step by step to the height to which Samuel's words (ver. 27) lead. Thus this prophetic prediction concerning something altogether external and trivial has in this connection a high ethical and psychological importance, and is subservient to the objective theocratic interest. It belonged to the *pedagogic* momenta in the conduct of the prophet towards the future king, among which also we must reckon that which is indicated in the words: "All that is in thy heart I will show thee." Samuel searched into Saul's inner being in its good and bad sides.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1. OSIANDER: That which is despised before the world, God chooses and brings forward, 1 Cor. i. 26 sq.—Ver. 3 sq. CRAMER: God makes in His great matters an insignificant beginning.—Ver. 4. CALVIN: How wonderful are the ways of God's wisdom, which lie far remote from human expectation. We see here how winding go the ways of God, so that it seems as if there were only an uncertain swaying to and fro; but yet with Him there is always a clear light away into the infinite, and what proceeds from Him is never confused and fortuitous. We draw from this the wholesome lesson that God leads us by His hand like blind men, and that we should ascribe nothing to our own prudence and exertion when any thing great becomes our portion. Our thoughts were not only far removed from that which finally happens, but exactly opposed to it.—Ver. 6. STARKE: Man's doing is not in his own power, and no one can mark out his own going.—Even insignificant people can often give wholesome counsels, 2 Kings v. 13; vii. 13. [The servant teaching the master. In like manner many an eminent minister has learned true religion from some servant or humble acquaintance. The lowly are often unconsciously training others for lofty station.—TR.]—Ver. 9. CRAMER: Teachers are seers, for through preaching they open our eyes, to give us the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, 2 Cor. iv. 6.—S. SCHMID: Even the meeting of men, whether for good or evil, is not a matter of chance, but is directed by divine Providence, Acts viii. 29 sq. [Vers. 3–8. MATT. HENRY: Here is: I. A great man rising from small beginnings. II. A great event rising from small occurrences. "Peradventure he can show us." To make prophecy, the glory of Israel, serve so mean a turn as this, discovered too plainly what manner of spirit they were of. Note, most people would rather be told

their fortune than told their duty; how to be rich than how to be saved. If it were the business of the men of God to direct for the recovery of lost asses, they would be consulted much more than they are, now that it is their business to direct for the recovery of lost souls.—TR.]

Vers. 1–14. J. DISSELHOFF: *The first test* to which God subjects His servant. It embraces two main points: 1) Whether with certain natural talents and advantages which God has given him he will in humility and quiet obedience do the work enjoined upon him; 2) Whether when his work proves useless he will seek help from the seer of God.—The Most High God appoints a *testing* for His servant Saul; and so whoever is summoned to the service of God knows that for him also there must be a testing.—"Seek the asses," said Kish to his son Saul. "And he went!"—went silently, joyously, humbly, obediently, faithfully, to the work which was enjoined upon him, from Ephraim to Shalisha—unwearied, unreluctant, without grumbling, although it was a work in which no greater credit was to be won than that of fidelity in trifles.—Out of such people God can make something.—Go, friend, if you wish to be the Lord's servant, even though you should have to walk in unknown ways. Saul did not shrink from them.—Ver. 5. *Why was Saul's labor in vain?* He had to find the seer, the man experienced in the ways of God. The vain seeking, the servant who first spoke of the seer, the maidens who showed the way, all must contribute towards bringing Saul to seek help in the revelation of God. If now it should occur to thee also that every thing here miscarries, that you are nothing, and you already feel like saying to your heart, "Come, let us go home again," then to thee also there will doubtless some one cry out, "Well, to revelation, that you may know the wonderful ways of God, on which God leads His saints."—Wait not till God Himself steps into thy way. Even to Saul God did not Himself speak. A servant began it; maidens drawing water showed the way. See how smoothly and simply God causes all that to occur, as it were, without noise and uproar. The God of the lowly and quiet chooses also for his feet quiet, lowly, shady ways. [Vers. 1–10. *The youth of Saul:* 1) He was reared in good circumstances (ver. 1); 2) He was remarkable for his great stature and manly beauty (ver. 2; x. 24); 3) A quiet rustic, little acquainted with matters away from home (ver. 6); 4) Tenderly considerate of his father's feelings (ver. 5); 5) Ready to take advice (ver. 10) (HALL: The chief praise is to be able to give good advice; the next is to take it); 6) Very modest and courteous (ver. 21). With these pleasing traits might be compared the character corrupted in his later years by unbelieving disobedience towards God, by jealousy, by the exercise of despotic power, *etc.*, and at every point there would be useful lessons.—TR.]

Ver. 16. STARKE: Even those things which arise from the free will of man, and appear as if they happened by chance, lie under the secret providence and government of God. Well is it then for those who in faith and tranquillity give themselves up to God's guidance (Ps. cxxxix. 5).—HALL: The eye of God's providence sees not only all our deeds, but also all our movements; we can go nowhere without Him; He numbers all our steps (Psa. cxxxix. 1 sq.).—[Vers. 11–17. The supernatural coöperating with the natural. Saul, by *natural* means, through the control of Providence, is brought to Samuel, who has been *supernaturally* prepared to receive and instruct him. So now the teachings of Providence unite with the teachings of revelation and of the Holy Spirit, to show men their duty and their destiny.—TR.]—Ver. 21. CRAMER: Humility is a beautiful virtue; and he whom God exalts to honors should think often of the dust in which he before lay, and from which he has been exalted (Psalm cxiii. 7, 8). [HALL: How kindly doth Samuel entertain and invite Saul, yet it was he only that should receive wrong by the future royalty of Saul. Who would not have looked that aged Samuel should have emulated rather the glory of his young rival, and have looked churlishly upon the man that should rob him of his authority?—TR.]

BERLEB. BIBLE: When God has chosen a man to help others, and he rightly knows himself, nothing causes him such wonder and amazement as a revelation of God's purpose concerning him. This distrust, however, does not put an end to his obedience to the will of God. For the more a man is convinced of his own nothingness, so much the more is he also convinced of the power of God, as the One who makes every thing out of nothing.—Vers. 26, 27. Saul must wait patiently till God should bring him out of concealment and make it manifest who he was. So should we also, if God has lent us gifts and wishes them to remain concealed with us, not be displeased at the fact that they are not recognized, and that we get no recognition and admiration for them, but quietly wait until the Lord Himself, as it seemeth Him good, carries further the matter He has begun, and Himself secures for it recompense and recognition.—Thus God often deals wonderfully with us, when He so tests our humility and modesty, and so leads us on His ways, that our reason cannot comprehend them. The beginnings of His matters are often so insignificant and little, that outwardly nothing appears but great weakness, and absolutely nothing great and wonderful comes forward, in order that we may *learn to hope against hope*.

Vers. 15–27 sq. DISSELHOFF: *The call to the service of God*. The history of Saul's call brings before our eyes three points: 1) What an abundant blessing there is for obedience—the call to the service of God; 2) What a great danger lies hid in this blessing—idle self-exaltation because of this call; 3) To what a blessed stillness the danger leads when overcome—to preparation for the calling. [Contrast Saul the king and Saul the apostle. WORDSWORTH: Saul the king is our warning; Saul the apostle is our example. The former shows how wretched man is if he labors for his own glory, and if he is without God's grace; the latter, how blessed he is if he relies on God's grace, and lives and dies for His glory.—Good trains of thought for sermons are indicated above in HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL, No. 2 and No. 3.—TR.]

SECOND SECTION.

Saul's Introduction into the Royal Office.

Chapter X. 1–27.

I. *Saul anointed by Samuel.* Ver. 1.

1 Then [And] Samuel took a vial of oil, and poured[1] it upon his head, and kissed
him, and said, Is it not[2] because the Lord [Jehovah] hath anointed thee to be cap-
tain [prince] over his inheritance?

II. *The Signs of the Divine Confirmation given to Saul.* Vers. 2–16.

2 When thou art departed [goest] from me to-day, then [*om.* then] thou shalt
[wilt] find two men by Rachel's sepulchre in the border of Benjamin at Zelzah;
and they will say unto [to] thee, The asses which thou wentest to seek are found;
and lo, thy father hath left the care[3] of the asses, and sorroweth for you, saying,
3 What shall I do for my son? Then [And] thou shalt go on forward from thence,
and thou shalt come to the plain [oak][4] of Tabor, and there [*ins.* three men] shall
meet thee three men [*om.* three men] going up to God to Bethel, one carrying three
kids, and another carrying three[5] loaves of bread, and another carrying a bottle of
4 wine. And they will salute thee,[6] and give thee two *loaves* of bread, which thou
5 shalt receive of their hands. After that thou shalt [wilt] come to the hill of God,[7]
where is the garrison of the Philistines;[8] and it shall come to pass, when thou art
come thither to the city, that thou shalt [wilt] meet a company of prophets[9] coming
down from the high place, with [*ins.* and before them, *om.* with] a psaltery and a
tabret and a pipe and a harp before them [*om.* before them], and they shall pro-
6 phesy [prophesying]; And the Spirit of the Lord [Jehovah] will come upon thee,
and thou shalt [wilt] prophesy with them, and shalt [wilt] be turned into another
7 man. And let it be [*om.* let it be], when these signs are come unto thee, that [*om.*
that] thou do [do thou] as occasion serve thee [what thy hand findeth]; for God[10]
8 is with thee. And thou shalt go[11] down before me to Gilgal, and behold, I will
come down unto thee, to offer burnt-offerings, and to sacrifice sacrifices of peace-
offerings; seven days shalt thou tarry till I come to thee, and show thee what
thou shalt do.
9 And it was *so* [came to pass] that, when he had turned his back to go from Samuel,
God gave him another heart; and all these signs came to pass that day. And

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

1 [Ver. 1. יִצֹק Qal. Impf. of יָצַק.—Tr.]

2 [Ver. 1. On the Sept. insertion here see Expos.—Tr.]

3 [Ver. 2. Lit. "hath put aside the affair."—Tr.]

4 [Ver. 3. אֵלוֹן, rendered "oak" by all the ancient versions except Chald. The Eng. A. V. always translates it "plain" (though it gives the similar words אַלּוֹן, אַלָּה, אֵלָה always by "oak" or some other name of a tree), apparently following Targ., Raschi, Kimchi. The origin of this Jewish rendering is perhaps to be sought in or connected with the Syriac—*alune*—"places abounding in gardens"—a "plain" or "place abounding in trees" being regarded as more appropriate than an "oak." Others make it here a proper name, Elon-Tabor.—Tr.]

5 [Ver. 3. Note the form of the Heb. numeral, masc. though the subst. is fem. (Wellh.).—Tr.]

6 [Ver. 4. Lit. "ask after thy peace (or welfare)."—Tr.]

7 [Ver. 5. Chald.: "the hill on which is the ark of Jehovah."—Tr.]

8 [Ver. 5. Wellhausen takes this clause as subst., not adj.; that is, not as describing the hill (or, as some read, Gibeah) of God, but as indicating a particular spot on or near the hill. The rendering "Gibeah of God" (*Bib. Comm.*) is very unusual and hard, and it is no objection to the appellative rendering here that the same word (Gibeah) is a proper name elsewhere in this chapter (vers. 10, 26).—Tr.]

9 [Ver. 5. Chald.: Sopherim "scribes."—Tr.]

10 [Ver. 7. The Chald. renders: "the word of Jehovah"—an appellation which is usually compared with the Logos of the New Test.—Tr.]

11 [Ver. 8. Erdmann makes this a general relative clause: "and when thou goest." See his discussion in the Expos. and Introd.—Tr.]

10 when they came thither to the hill [to Gibeah],[12] behold a company of prophets
met him, and the Spirit of God came upon him, and he prophesied among them.
11 And it came to pass, when all that knew him beforetime saw that behold [and be-
hold] he prophesied among the prophets,[13] then the people said one to another,
What is this that is come [What has happened] unto [to] the son of Kish? Is
12 Saul also among the prophets? And one of the same place answered and said, But
[And] who is their[14] father? Therefore it became a proverb, Is Saul also among
13 the prophets? And when he had made an end of prophesying, he came to the
14 high place.[15] And Saul's uncle said unto [to] him and to his servant, Whither
went ye? And he said, To seek the asses; and when we saw that they were no
15 where,[16] we came [went] to Samuel. And Saul's uncle said, Tell me, I pray thee,
16 what Samuel said unto [to] you. And Saul said unto [to] his uncle, He told us
plainly [*om.* plainly][17] that the asses were found. But of the matter of the king-
dom, whereof Samuel spake, he told him not.

III. *The Choice by Lot.* Vers. 17–21.

17 And Samuel called the people together unto the Lord [to Jehovah] to Mizpeh
18 [Mizpah]. And [*ins.* he] said unto [to] the children of Israel, Thus saith the Lord
[Jehovah] God of Israel, I brought up Israel out of Egypt, and delivered you out
of the hand of the Egyptians,[18] and out of the hand of all [*ins.* the] kingdoms *and*
19 of them [*om.* and of them] that oppressed[19] you. And ye have this day rejected
your God, who himself saved you out of all your adversities and your tribulations,
and ye [*om.* ye] have said unto him [*om.* unto him], *Nay* [Nay],[20] but [*ins.* a king
thou shalt] set a king [*om.* a king] over us. Now, therefore [And now], present
20 yourselves before the Lord [Jehovah] by your tribes and by your thousands. And
when [om. when] Samuel had [*om.* had] caused all the tribes of Israel to come
21 near, [*ins.* and] the tribe of Benjamin was taken. [*Ins.* And] When [*om.* when]
he had [*om.* had] caused the tribe of Benjamin to come near by their families [*ins.*
and] the family of Matri [the Matrites] was taken.[21] And Saul, the son of Kish,
was taken; and when [*om.* when] they sought him, [*ins.* and] he could not be
found.

IV. *The Installation into the Royal Office. Proclamation. Greeting. Royal Right. Return to Quiet Life.* Vers. 22–27.

22 Therefore [And] they inquired of the Lord [Jehovah] further, if the man should
[would] yet come thither.[22] And the Lord answered [Jehovah said], Behold, he
23 hath hid himself [is hidden] among the stuff [baggage]. And they ran and fetched
him thence; and when [*om.* when] he stood[23] among the people [*ins.* and] he was
24 higher than any of the people from his shoulders and upward. And Samuel said
to all the people, See ye him whom the Lord [Jehovah] hath chosen, that there is

[12] [Ver. 10. The place here mentioned is almost certainly Gibeah, Saul's place of residence, and may or may not be the same with the "hill of God" in ver. 5.—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 11. Erdmann takes this clause to be a quotation, but the Heb. does not favor this. Here the verb rendered "prophesy" is Niphal, while in vers. 10, 5, 6 it is Hithpael. According to Dr. R. Payne Smith, the former indicates true prophetical utterance, the latter merely acting the part of a prophet (*Bampton Lectures* for 1869, pp. 53–58); but this distinction must not be pressed too far.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 12. Sept., Syr., Arab. have "his father;" see Erdmann's discussion in Expos. Chald has "their master (Rab)."—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 13. For "high place" (בָּמָה) Wellhausen would read unnecessarily "house" (בַּיְתָה).—Tr.]

[16] [Ver. 14. "That they were not" (comp. Gen. xlii. 36); that is, not to be found.—Tr.]

[17] [Ver. 16. The Inf. Absol., for which this adverb is too definite.—Tr.]

[18] [Ver. 18. Sept.: "The hand of Pharaoh, king of Egypt,"—a variation for the sake of distinctness or accuracy.—Tr.]

[19] [Ver. 18. *Constructio ad sensum:* the kingdoms representing their inhabitants. The Partcp. is made masc. —Tr.]

[20] [Ver. 19. The text has לוֹ, "to him," and so Erdmann reads. Sept., Vulg., Syr., Arab. read לֹא, "nay,"—and this is required by the following כִּי. Eng. A. V. reads "to him," and then inserts the "nay,"—thus combining the two readings. So, too, the Chald., which, however, here paraphrases: instead of "rejected God," it has "rejected the service of God" (to avoid apparent irreverence), and makes the people say: "We are not saved, but thou shalt set," *etc.*—Tr.]

[21] [Ver. 21. On the insertion of the Sept.: "and they cause the family of Mattari to come near by individuals," see Erdmann in the Expos.—Tr.]

[22] [Ver. 22. The Heb. reads literally: "has any other man come hither?" and so Erdmann translates; but it was unnecessary to ask Jehovah this, nor does Jehovah's answer correspond to it. The Syr., conforming the question to the answer, reads "where is this man?" which, however, cannot be gotten from the Heb. The Eng. A. V. represents the text of the Sept. and Vulg., the word "man" having the Article, and this reading is approved by Thenius, *Bib. Comm.*, and others, and opposed by Keil and Erdmann. See the Expos.—Tr.]

[23] [Ver. 23. Lit. "placed or presented himself."—Tr.]

none like him among all the people? And all the people shouted, and said, God
save [Long live][24] the king.
25 And Samuel told the people the manner[25] of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book,[25]
and laid it up before the Lord [Jehovah]. And Samuel sent all the people away,
26 every man to his house. And Saul also went home to Gibeah; and there went
27 with him a band of men,[26] whose hearts God had touched. But [And] the children
of Belial [certain wicked men] said, How shall this man save us? And they despised him, and brought him no presents. But he held his peace [And he was as
though he were deaf].[27]

[24] [Ver. 24. Lit. "may the king live."—Tr.]

[25] [Ver. 25. מִשְׁפָּט is rendered by Erdmann "right or privilege" (*recht*); see on viii. 11. The Heb. Art. in הַסֵּפֶר ("the book") is correctly represented in Eng. by the Indef. Art., since the defining circumstances are left wholly unmentioned.—Tr.]

[26] [Ver. 26. Erdmann: "the band of valiant (or honest, *braver männer*) men." Philippson: *die tapferen*, "the valiant men." Cahen: *les gens de guerre*, "the men of war." The Heb. word (הַחַיִל) is a military one, "the host." But it can hardly mean that the army went with Saul, and so the Vulg. renders "a part of the army." The Chald. paraphrase does not help us: "a part of the people who feared sin;" the Syriac renders literally by the same word as the Heb. The Sept. reading, "sons of might," that is, "the better class of men," "the men of honor and reputation," is more satisfactory, on which see Expos.—Tr.]

[27] [Ver. 27. Heb. "as a deaf man," or, "as one that did not observe." The Eng. A. V. omits the particle "as."—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

I. Ver. 1. *The anointing*. It is performed without witnesses in secret (ix. 27), and is the factual confirmation to Saul of what Samuel had before told him in God's name of his call to the kingdom. The *vial* (פַּךְ, from פָּכָה, "to drop, flow," in Pi. only Ez. xlvii. 2) is a narrow-necked vessel, from which the oil flowed in drops. The oil, we must suppose, was not of the ordinary sort, but the holy anointing-oil (Ex. xxix. 7, xxx. 23–33, xxvii. 29) which, according to the Law, was used in the consecration of the sacred vessels and the priests. To this refers the expression "*the* vial of oil;" and it is supported by the analogy of the priest's consecration with the consecrated oil (Lev. viii. 12), which, according to Ex. xxx. 31, was to be a holy oil throughout all generations, and by the use here and 2 Kings ix. 3 of the word (יָצַק), which is proper to the anointing of the high-priest. Besides, on account of the significance of the oil of priestly consecration, Samuel would have used no other in the consecration of the sacred person of the theocratic king. *Anointing* as a solemn usage in the *consecration of a king* is referred to as early as Judg. ix. 8, 15, and, besides Saul here, is expressly mentioned as performed on other kings, on David (xvi. 3; 2 Sam. ii. 4; v. 3), Absalom (2 Sam. xix. 11), Solomon (1 Kings i. 39), Joash (2 Kings xi. 12), Jehoahaz (2 Kings xxiii. 30), and Jehu (2 Kings ix. 3). In case of regular succession the anointing was supposed to continue its effect [that is, the regular successor needed no new anointing—such is the view of the Rabbis—Tr.]; whence is explained the fact that only the above kings are mentioned as having been anointed [they being all founders of dynasties, or irregularly advanced to the throne—Tr.] (Oehl., Herz. *R.-E.* VIII. 10 sq.). On account of this anointing the theocratic king was called "the Anointed of the Lord." Whence we see the general significance of the act: The Anointed was consecrated, sanctified to God; by the anointing the king is holy and unassailable (1 Sam. xxiv. 7; xxvi. 9; 2 Sam. xix. 22). It signifies, however, further in especial the equipment with the powers and gifts of the *Spirit of God* and the blessing of the salvation which is bestowed in them (comp. xvi. 13). In accordance with the significance of the act of anointing it is narrated in vers. 9, 10 how the Spirit of God came upon Saul. While the anointing thus set forth the divine consecration from above, the *kiss*, which Samuel then gave Saul, was the sign of the human recognition of his royal dignity, the expression of reverence and homage, as in Ps. ii. 12. The kiss, seldom on the mouth, generally on the hand, knee, or garment [among modern Beduins on the forehead—Tr.], has always been in the East the universal sign of subordination and subjection, and is so yet, as also among the Slavic nations. The kissing of *idols* (their feet) is mentioned as a religious usage (1 Kings xix. 18; Hos. xiii. 2; Job xxxi. 27). The word with which Samuel turns to Saul after the anointing: **Is it not that the Lord hath anointed thee?** is witness and confirmation to him that Samuel is only the instrument in God's hand in the consecration, that it is God's act. (The הֲלֹא, with the following כִּי, signifies "yea, surely." *Clericus:* an interrogation, instead of an affirmation"). **Prince over his inheritance.** נָגִיד, "leader, prince." "*His inheritance*" is Israel, not only because of the great *deliverance* out of Egypt, Deut. iv. 20 (Keil), but also on the ground of the divine *choice* of Israel out of the mass of the heathen nations to be His *own* people (Ex. xix. 5). The Sept. rendering in vers. 1, 2 is as follows: "*hath not* the Lord anointed *thee* ruler over his people, over Israel? And thou shalt rule over the people of the Lord, and thou shalt save them out of the hand of their enemies. And this be to thee the sign *that* the Lord hath anointed thee ruler over his inheritance." This last clause "*that* . . . . . . *inheritance*" is the literal translation of the Masoretic text. The Vulg. has these words in the *first* sentence: "behold, the Lord hath anointed thee prince over his inheritance;" then follows the addition: "and thou shalt deliver his people out of the hands of their enemies round about. And this is the sign to thee that the Lord

hath anointed thee prince." These words of the Sept. and Vulg. are, however, not (with Then.) to be used to fill up a supposed gap in the text: We are rather to adopt Keil's remark that the Alex. text is merely a gloss from ix. 16, 17, introduced because the translator did not understand the "is it not that?", and especially because he did not see how Samuel could speak to Saul of signs [ver. 7] without having before announced them as such. The gloss assumes that Samuel wished merely to give Saul a sign that the Lord had anointed him prince. On the contrary, as Keil points out, Samuel gave Saul *not a sign* (*σημεῖον*, אוֹת), but *three signs*, and declares (ver. 7) their purpose to be, that, on their occurrence, Saul should know what he had to do, Jehovah being with him.

II. Vers. 2–16. *The divine signs. Three signs* are given Saul by Samuel in his capacity of prophet, as a *confirmation* to him that he is now, according to the divine consecration, also *really the king of Israel*, and *under the immediate guidance of the Lord* (vers. 2; 3, 4; 5, 6).

The first sign, ver. 2: *The meeting with two men of his native place*, who will inform him that the asses are found, and his father anxious about him. According to *these* words, *the sepulchre of Rachel* must have been *not far* from *Ramah*, whence Saul started. With this agrees Jer. xxxi. 15: "a voice is heard in *Ramah*,—*Rachel* weeping for her children." The declaration in Matt. ii. 18, that the mourning of the women of Bethlehem for their slaughtered children is the fulfilment of this word of Jeremiah, does not affirm or suppose that Rachel's grave was near Bethlehem, and therefore far from Ramah south of Jerusalem, for it is not a local, but a personal-real similarity, namely, between the mournings in the two cases, that is intended to be set forth. According to our passage, Rachel's grave must have been north of Jerusalem on the road between Ramah and Gibeah; and thus the view prevalent since the Middle Ages, that Rachel's tomb was *near Bethlehem*, and somewhat *north* of it, is shown to be incorrect. In support of this view are cited the passages Gen. xxxv. 16–20 and xlviii. 7, where Rachel's sepulchre is said to have been a *kibrah* of land "as one goes to Ephrah," and "on the road to Ephrah," and in respect to *Ephrah* the explanation is added: "which is now called *Bethlehem*" (comp. 1 Sam. xvii. 12; Mic. v. 2); but these indefinite expressions (*kibrah* is merely *tract*, see 2 Kings v. 19 sq.) may, as Winer correctly remarks (*Bibl. R.-W. s. v. Rachel*, II., 299), be so understood as to extend to Ramah. So Ewald: "Here, as in Genesis, we may very well understand the northern boundary of Benjamin, beginning somewhat southeast from Ram-allah" (III. 31, Rem.). If, however, in Genesis Rachel's grave be taken to be (as the narrator intends) not far from *Ephrah*, then, on account of the indubitable proximity of the grave to Ramah, this Ephrah cannot be the Bethlehem which lay in Judah six Roman miles south of Jerusalem, and the explanatory remark, "which is now called Bethlehem," must be regarded as a late, erroneous addition. Ephrah is, then, to be looked on as an otherwise unknown place, in the region in which Bethel, Ramah and Gibeah lay, perhaps the same with the city *Ephraim*, named in connection with *Bethel* in 2 Chron. xiii. 19 (Qeri עֶפְרַיִן Ephrain, Kethib עֶפְרוֹן Ephron) and Jos. B. J. 4, 9. 9, and mentioned in Jno. xi. 54, according to Jerome twenty Roman miles (Onom. s. v. Ephron) north of Jerusalem (comp. Josh. xv. 9), named *Ephron*, according to von Raumer's conjecture (p. 216 A. 235 *e*) identical with *Ophrah* (comp. 1 Sam. xiii. 17).* On this supposition the grave of Rachel was, according to Graf, "very near Rama (1 Sam. x. 2), at the intersection of the road from Bethel to the neighboring Ephrah (2 Sam. xiii. 23; 2 Chron. xiii. 19; see Then. and Bertheau *in loco*, Gen. xxxv. 16 sq.; xlviii. 7), and the road from Ramah to Gibeah" (*Der Proph. Jer.*, p. 384, and *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, p. 868, on the site of Bethel and Ramah). **On the border of Benjamin.** This agrees with the supposition that Rachel's grave was near Bethel (so Kurtz, *Gesch. d. A. B.* I., 270 [*Hist. of the Old Covenant*]), which was on the border between Ephraim and Benjamin. **At Zelzah.** This word must at an early time have been uncertain, to judge from the variations of the versions (Sept.: *ἄνδρας ἀλλομένους μεγάλα*, whence Ewald renders "in great haste," and Vulg.: *in meridie*). If we do not regard it as an unknown place, we may adopt Thenius' conjecture, that the original text was: "*at Zela*" (בְּצֵלָעָה, בְּ with ה local); Zela was the place of the sepulchre of Saul's father (2 Sam. xxi. 14).—The statement of the two men that the asses were found was not only to be to Saul a confirmation of Samuel's prophetic declarations, but also to detach his thoughts from lower earthly things, and direct his inner life to the higher calling, to which he had been privately elected and consecrated. Ewald: "Thus happily disappears the burden of former lower cares, because henceforth something more important is to be thought of and cared for" (III. 31).

Vers. 3, 4. *The second sign.* Three men on the way to the holy place at Bethel, to sacrifice there, will bestow on him two loaves of bread from their sacrificial gifts. The direction of the road, and the whole geographical situation here correspond very well with the statement in Genesis xxxv. 8 as to the *oak* (אַלּוֹן, *Allon*) near which, "*beneath Bethel*," Deborah, the nurse of Rebekah, was buried, and with the statement in Judg. iv. 5, that Deborah dispensed judgment "between *Ramah* and *Bethel* in Mount Ephraim" under the *palm-tree of Deborah*. It is therefore a natural supposition (Then.) that, by error of hearing, *Tabor* was written instead of *Deborah*. But this hypothesis is somewhat bold, and against it is the fact that all the ancient translations have "*Tabor*." That this is "certainly a mere dialectic variation of Deborah" (Ew. III., 31 Rem. 2) is an equally bold opinion. Besides, Judg. iv. 5 speaks of "the *palm-tree* of Deborah," named, according to the narrator, from the *Judge* Deborah, and known in his time, therefore, to be distinguished from the *oak* of Deborah, the nurse of Rebekah, Gen. xxxv. 8. The place of the *terebinth of Tabor*, therefore, otherwise unknown, must be in any case on the road to *Bethel*, not far from Ramah. The three men are "going up to *God* to *Bethel*." The things that they carry (three kids, three

* [This is to cut the knot rather than to solve the geographical difficulties connected with Saul's journey. See i. 1 and ix. 6, Expos. and Translator's notes.—Tr.]

loaves of bread, and a vessel of wine) show that their purpose is to make an offering to God in Bethel. Bethel had been a consecrated place for the worship of God since the days of the Patriarchs, in consequence of the revelations which He had made to *Abraham* and *Jacob;* as to the former see Gen. xii. 8; xiii. 3, 4, as to the latter Gen. xxviii. 18; xix. 35; vi. 7, 14, 15. In Bethel, therefore, there was an altar; it was one of the places where the people sacrificed to the Lord, and where Samuel at this time held court. The "*asking after welfare*" signifies friendly *salutation* (1 Sam. xvii. 22; 2 Kings x. 13; Ex. xviii. 7; Judg. xviii. 15). The men will give him, an unknown person, *two of their loaves.* This divinely-ordained occurrence betokens the *homage*, which by the presentation of gifts pertains to him as the king of the people. "And that this surprising prelude to all future royal gifts is taken from bread of offering points to the fact, that in future some of the wealth of the land, which has hitherto gone undivided to the Sanctuary, will go to the king." (Ew., *Gesch.* III., 32 [*Hist. of Israel*]).

Vers. 5, 6. *The third sign.* Going thence to Gibeah he will meet a company of prophets, will, under the influence of prophetic inspiration, *also* prophesy, and be changed into another man. *Gibeah Ha-Elo-him* is in the immediate context distinguished from the "*city.*" What *city* is here meant is clear from the fact that all the people know him (ver. 10 sqq.); it can, therefore, only be *Gibeah* of *Benjamin*, Saul's native city. The "*Gibeah of God*" is thus, and especially because of the definition "of God," to be taken not as a proper name, but as an appellative, "the hill of God," that is, the height, Bamah [high-place] near the city, which was used as a place of sacrifice, and after which the city was called; afterwards, when Saul made it his royal residence, it was called *Gibeah of Saul* (xi. 4; xv. 34; 2 Sam. xxi. 6). According to Josephus (B. J. 5, 2. 1) it was one hour [somewhat more than two Eng. miles; according to Mr. Grove, in Smith's *Dict. of Bib.*, four miles—TR.] on the direct road north from Jerusalem, and, as appears from what follows, was probably the seat of a community of prophets, and, on that account, perhaps specially distinguished, along with Bethel, among the sacrificial places. The 'נְצִבֵי פ ["garrison" in Eng. A. V.] are the military posts or camps established by the Philistines to keep the country under their sway, even though there were no more devastating incursions (see on vii. 14). For a similar procedure see 2 Sam. viii. 6, 14. The substitution of the Sing. (נְצִיב) for the Plu. is supported by the Sept., Vulg., Syr., Arab.; but it is going too far to suppose, on the authority of the Sept., that here, as well as in xiii. 3, 4, this Sing. denotes a *pillar* set up by the Philistines as a sign of their authority (Then. and Böttcher)*. Ewald's opinion (*Gesch.* III., 43) that it refers to an officer who collected the tribute, is still less probable. Instead of a monument, we must regard it, according to xiii. 3, 4, and as in 2 Sam. viii. 6, 14, as a military colony stationed there.—A company of *prophets* (חֶבֶל, "cord, line," then like our "*band*, company"). From this description, and from the fact that they approach with music, it appears that they formed a *society*, an *organized* company. That they *descended from the Bamah* [high-place] is no proof that they dwelt on it, against which is the fact that the Bamah was especially consecrated to the service of Jehovah, and for this reason was called the "hill of God," *not* "because it was the abode of men of God" (Cleric.). Since it is clear, from what follows, that this was a *private solemn procession*, it is probable that their residence was not far off, most likely in the city of Gibeah, whence they may have proceeded to the sacrifice and prayer on the high-place. This company of prophets belongs, no doubt, to the so-called *Schools of the Prophets*, which, however, would be better named prophetic *Unions.* They were founded by Samuel, and were under his direction, comp. xix. 20. The *origin* of these unions lies in the tendency to *association* given by the Spirit of God and by the new life which Samuel awakened, and their *aim* was to cherish and develop prophetic inspiration and the new life of faith by common holy exercises. In our passage we must distinguish the following facts: 1) The *descent from the high-place* in this solemn procession suggests that they had gathered there for common religious exercises, sacrifice, and prayer. 2) The *music* which went before them shows that, in these societies, religious feeling was nourished and heightened by sacred music, though music was also elsewhere cultivated. The *four instruments* which accompanied them indicate the rich *variety* and *advanced culture* of the music of that day. The *psaltery* (נֶבֶל, *nebel*) is a cithern-like stringed instrument, which, according to Jerome, Isidorus and Cassiodorus, had the form of an inverted Delta, and, according to Ps. xxxiii. 2; cxliv. 9, had ten strings (Jos. *Ant.* 7, 10 says twelve strings), called by the Greeks νάβλα, *nablium, psalterium;* it was commonly used, as here, in sacred songs of praise (1 Kings x. 12; 1 Chron. xv. 16), but also on secular festive occasions (2 Chron. xx. 28). The *kinnor* (כִּנּוֹר [Eng. A. V. harp]) was another stringed instrument, apparently different from our *harp* (Luther), since it was played on in walking (comp. 2 Sam. vi. 5), rather a sort of *guitar*, and with the *nebel* indicates complete string music (Psalm lxxi. 22; cviii. 3 [2]; cl. 3). According to Josephus (*Ant.* 7, 12, 3) the kinnor was struck with the plectrum, the nablium with the finger. But David played the kinnor (xvi. 23; xviii. 10; xix. 9) with the *hand.* The *tabret* (תֹּף, *toph*) is the hand-drum, the tambourine; used by Miriam, Ex. xv. 20. The fourth instrument is the *flute* (חָלִיל), which was made of reed, wood, or horn, and was a favorite instrument in festive and mournful music. 3) The emphasis rests on the words "*and they were prophesying;*" they were in a condition of ecstatic inspiration, in which, singing or speaking, with accompaniment of music, they gave expression to the overflowing feeling with which their hearts were filled from above by the controlling Spirit. Cleric: "they will sing songs, which assuredly were composed to the honor of God." The strains of the music

* On וְהָיָה Böttcher remarks: "as *Jussive* it can only mean '*and be it — and when,*' so that וּפָגַעְתָּ belongs to the protasis, and the apodosis begins with וְצָלְחָה [ver. 6]." So 1 Kings xiv. 5, where וִיהִי, "and be it"—"even if."

were intended not only to awaken the heart to inspired praise of God, or to intensify the religious inspiration, but also to regulate the feeling. According to Pindar, it was "peacefully to bring law into the heart" that Apollo invented the cithern, which was played in the Delphic Apollo-worship (O. Müller, *Dorier* I., 346 [*Dorians*]). There was a similar outflow of religious inspiration to the praise of God in the case of the seventy elders, Num. xi. 25.—Ver. 6. Saul will not be able to withstand the mighty influence of this sight. *Three* things will happen to him: 1) the *Spirit of the Lord*, a divine power external to himself, will "*come upon him;*" that is, suddenly, immediately take possession of his soul. The words "Spirit of Jehovah" exclude every earthly, internal case of inspiration. It is, however, in this presupposed that the Spirit of the Lord must descend to produce this excitation and elevation, and does not dwell continually in him; 2) he will *prophesy*. (On the form הִתְנַבִּית see Ew. § 198, 6.) He will, therefore, have a part in the religious inspiration and the prophetic utterance of the prophets. It is taken for granted that the fire of inspiration will pass immediately from them to him; 3) he will be *turned into another man*. The change relates to the *inner* life, which is renewed by the Spirit of God, and consists in the sanctification of heart and subordination of the will to the law of the Lord which the Spirit works. The prophecy [of Samuel], therefore, is: Thou wilt, through the Spirit of God which shall come upon thee, not only prophesy in inspired *words*, but also experience a change of the inner man, as accords with thy divine call to be king.

Ver. 7. The general *significance* of the *occurrence* of these signs. **When these signs come to thee** (read תְּבֹאֶינָה, Ps. xlv. 16, "when all this *happens to thee*"), **do what thy hand findeth**—the same formula in xxv. 8 and Judg. ix. 33, not, what thou likest, what seems most proper, "what seems good to thee," (Cler.), but, what presents itself, "that to which this action leads," (Ew. III., 41), do what circumstances suggest; **for God is with thee,** "thou needst not consult any one, for God will second thy counsels" (Cler.). These signs are to signify to him that, so surely as they happen to him will he happily, with God's help, carry out his undertakings.—These words refer to Saul's immediate task in his royal calling (of which these God-given signs were to assure him), namely, the deliverance of the people from the oppression of the Philistines.

Ver. 8. Saul next receives from the prophet a command in God's name, which *limits* the unrestricted royal authority conferred on him under support of God; he is forbidden, in the exercise of the *royal* office, to perform independently *priestly* functions. *Gilgal*, situated between the Jordan and Jericho, formerly the camp of the people after the crossing of the Jordan, where were undertaken the wars against the Canaanites for the conquest of the land, the central point of Israel consecrated by the tabernacle and the sacrificial worship (Josh. v.) was now "one of the holiest places in Israel, and the true middle-point of the whole people,—because the control of the Philistines extended so far westward [eastward?] that the centre of gravity of the realm was necessarily pushed back to the bank of the Jordan" (Ew. III., 42). Hither must Saul as king betake himself, when he would enter on the deliverance of Israel from the dominion of the Philistines. "This place seems to have been chosen, because it was remotest from the Philistine border" (Cler.). "There the people assembled in general political questions, and thence, after sacrifice and prayer, marched armed to war. Here, then, especially, in the nature of the case, would the mutual relation of the two independent powers of the realm come into question, be announced, and somehow permanently decided" (Ew. as above). Samuel, therefore, bids Saul wait seven days, when he goes to Gilgal, in order that he, Samuel, may *direct the sacrifice*, and impart to him the Lord's *commands as to what he shall do*. Saul is not to make the offering in his own power—this pertains only to Samuel as priestly mediator between God and the people—nor is he to undertake independently anything in connection with the past struggle for freedom, but he must await the instructions which the prophet is to give him. The king must act only in dependence on the invisible King of his people. See further, on ver. 8 and its relation to xiii. 8, the Introduction, pp. 11, 12.

Vers. 9–12. *The occurrence of the signs announced to Saul*. Ver. 9 refers to the fulfilment of the last, most important element of the third prophecy (ver. 6): *the change into another man*. Not only the *fact* of this renewal, but also its innermost *source* is indicated in the words: **God gave** [lit. turned, changed] **him another heart**, two assertions being involved in this pregnant phrase: God turned him about, and gave him another heart. His departure from Samuel and turning to go back home, and his conversion are expressed, not without design, by the same word *turn;* for the place, from which he turned, was the *means* of this conversion; Samuel's person and word was the instrument by which God began in him the process of inward renewal; the Spirit of God, that *wrought* and completed it, came in part mediately through Samuel, in part immediately to his *heart* from above. According to the Biblical representation the *heart* denotes the centre of the whole inward life, the uniting-point of all the elements of the inner man. The *thorough* and *complete* change to *another* man can proceed only from the heart, which alone God in His judgments on man looks at (xvi. 7). The *essential* element, therefore, in the renewal of the heart is not only the *production* of a, as it were, new, hitherto latent side of his *spiritual* being—this is only its symptom—but in a real religious-ethical change and renewal of the innermost foundation of life. In this all special revelations of the divine spirit and will to Saul must culminate; all that has happened from ch. ix. on tends to this highest and innermost end, to the proper establishment of this religious-ethical relation of the innermost foundation of life to God, as the most essential condition of an administration of the theocratic office which should be well-pleasing to God.—**And all those signs came to pass that day.** From *Ramah* Saul could easily come to *Gibeah* the same day through the stations indicated. It is not mentioned in what order the signs occurred, but it is first *summarily* stated that they were all fulfilled, and then related how the *third* happened. If the summary statement

did not precede, and the third sign were related immediately, one might suppose with Thenius "a possible omission by the redactor;" but, the context of vers. 2-4 being thus [summarily] dispatched, the narrator hastens to the third sign as the most important, in order to show *how* and under what *circumstances* it occurred, after having made the remark, which was sufficient for his purpose, *that* the first and second had been fulfilled according to Samuel's words. It is worthy of note that none of the ancient translators has attempted to fill out the supposed gap. Thenius adopts the reading of the Sept. "from thence" (καὶ ἔρχεται ἐκεῖθεν), from which he infers the previous mention of another place; but even this reading would not prove an omission, but would refer to the place where Saul separated from Samuel, the journey being thus summarily described with omission of two stations. Further, the words "from thence" would be quite superfluous.—The שָׁם of the text [Eng. A. V. "thither"] is not to be translated *whither* (Bunsen: to Gibeah), but expresses local rest: "they come there to Gibeah."—The mention of the third sign only (there being nothing in narrative or language, as shown above, to necessitate the assumption of a historical or auctorial gap) is not to give importance to Gibeah, Saul's home (Keil); rather this sign was the most important for Saul's inner life, and for that on which depended the right exercise of the theocratic royal office, namely, the new heart and life called forth by the prophetic spirit, and it stands in causal connection with the preceding testimony (which is the principal thing) to the actual *renewal* of Saul's heart, narrating how Saul was equipped with the Spirit of the Lord, and filled with the prophetic Spirit, which changed his heart.—Ver. 10. From the local statements here made, it is tolerably clear that this company of prophets dwelt in *Gibeah*. In order to understand the *effect* of their appearance on Saul, we must think of it as it is described in ver. 5. *Suddenly, unannounced, overpoweringly* the Spirit comes upon him, "*falls upon*" him. *Involuntarily*, therefore, he is seized by it, and drawn along into the lofty inspiration of the prophets. By the influence of the Lord's Spirit, which Saul has hitherto experienced through Samuel, he is made capable of receiving the fullness of the prophetical Spirit, and of this sudden seizure by the prophetic inspiration, which thus manifested itself in music and song. **He prophesied**, that is, he united in their inspired song, or in the discourse in which their new life poured itself forth—**in their midst**, he attached himself to them, joined their solemn procession; meeting leads to uniting (the phrase, "in the midst," answers to the "towards him").—Ver. 11. **Before time** [lit. "from yesterday and the day before," and so Erdmann has it.—Tr.]. This universal previous acquaintance with Saul and the talk of the people among themselves is proof that he was here *at home*. The surprise produced by Saul's participation in the prophetic utterance is described with incomparable fidelity and liveliness. The two questions, which testify to surprise and amazement, presuppose two things: 1) the power and significance of the prophetic community in the public opinion, and 2) the fact that Saul's life had hitherto been far therefrom, that it had not been in harmony, either externally or internally, with this society; we see him suddenly introduced into a sphere which had hitherto been outwardly and inwardly strange to him. Clericus: "This seems to show that Saul had led a life very different from those who associated with the prophets."—Ver. 12. To the *questions:* "What has happened to the *son of Kish?* Is Saul also among the prophets?" *answer* is given by "*a man from there*" (from Gibeah) in a *counter-question*, which, by its form (the "who is their father?" referring to the "son of Kish"), ingeniously and decisively repels the false conception of the nature of this prophetic inspiration which lay in these questions. The explanation: "who is their *president?*" has no support in the connection, and no bearing on the matter. The Sept. has "who is *his* father?" (adding also [Alex.]: "is it not Kish?"): but this is arbitrary and obviously adopted to get rid of the difficulty in the text. And to suppose that the words: "Who is their father? Is it not Kish?" indicate that recognition as a prophet was denied Saul because of his descent from so insignificant a man as Kish (Then.), or that they merely express the *surprise* of the people (Ew.), would introduce an intolerable tautology into the lively, pregnant description. As a simple question, these words would mean nothing in the mouth of the man of Gibeah, who necessarily knew the answer, and could learn it from the connection in which the question was asked. The question "who is then their father?" rather refers to the prophets, in whose midst was even now the object of the question of surprise: Is the *son of Kish* a prophet? As Bunsen rightly remarks, the *their* is to be emphasized: "And who is *their* father?" We may suppose (in accordance with the situation) that the words were accompanied by an indicative gesture, and with Oehler (*Herz. R. E.* XII. 612) explain: "Have these then the prophetic spirit by a privilege of birth?" Bodily paternity is here of no importance; the son of Kish may as well be a prophet as these sons of fathers, who are wholly unknown to us, or of whom we should not, according to human reckoning, suppose that their sons would be filled with the prophetic Spirit. So Bunsen's admirable explanation: "The speaker declares, against the contemptuous remark about the son of Kish, that the prophets too owed their gift to no peculiarly lofty lineage. Saul also might, therefore, receive this gift, as a gift from God, not as a patrimony." In this counter-question lies this truth: the impartation of the prophetic Spirit, as of its gifts and powers, pertains to the free, gracious will of God, and is altogether independent of natural-human relations. The expression of surprise at the unexpected change in Saul gives occasion to the proverb: **Is Saul also among the prophets?** According to its origin here given, this proverb does not merely express surprise at the sudden unexpected transition of a man to another calling in life (Then., Cler.: "another manner of life"), or to a high and honorable position (Münster). The personal and moral qualities of Saul, perhaps the religious-moral character of his family, or at least the mean opinion that was entertained of Saul's qualities and capacities, intellectually, religiously

and morally, formed the ground of surprise at his sudden assumption of the prophetic character. The proverb, therefore, expresses astonishment at the unexpected appearance of a high spiritual endowment, and, still more, of a high religious-moral tone of life and soul, which has hitherto been foreign to, even (as it seems) opposed to, the person in question.

Vers. 13-16. *A family-scene: Saul and his uncle.* Ver. 13. The *cessation* of the prophesying was the result either of a sudden removal of the ecstatic inspiration which had come suddenly on him, or of a separation from the prophesying company. Saul came to the *Bamah* [high-place]. Instead of Bamah (במה), Then. (so Ew.) reads after the Sept. "to Gibeah" (*εἰς τὸν βουνόν*, הַגִּבְעָה). But this reading came from the supposed inability to reconcile Saul's going *up* to the high-place with the prophetic company's coming *down* thence, and Saul's return to his family in ver. 14, nor did it seem clear, why Saul went *up* thither. The last objection is removed by the simple suggestion, that Saul went *up* thither to pray and sacrifice in the holy place after his great experiences of the divine favor and goodness, and so after his return home first to give God the glory before he returned to his family-life. He joined the *descending* company of prophets in their solemn procession; but when his participation in the utterances of the prophetic inspiration was over, his look rested on the sacred height, whence the men had descended, and the impulse of the Spirit of the Lord forced him up thither, that, after the extraordinary offering he had made with the prophets, he might make the ordinary offering, and engage in worship. This was the aim, suggested by the connection of the whole history, of his ascent to the high-place.—Ver. 14. The *uncle* of Saul, here spoken of, was *Ner* (xiv. 51), who, like Kish (ix. 1), was a son of Abiel, not *Abner*, as Ewald, with Josephus, supposes. Either Saul's relations went up with him to the high-place, and the conversation with the uncle occurred there, or (as is natural in a summary statement, like this), we must suppose that Saul came down to his family. According to the narrative the former explanation is preferable. In the question and answer between Saul and his uncle, the history of the search after the asses is briefly recapitulated, vers. 14-16. Saul's laconic answer to the question of his uncle, who very properly speaks of so important a domestic matter, shows that his heart is fixed on higher things than the asses of his father. To the curious and at the same time inquisitorial question: **What said Samuel to you?** which shows what importance was attached to knowing the man's words exactly and fully, Saul answers shortly and to the point: **He said that they were found.** Thus the uncle, to whom this fact was long since known, was disposed of, and the long conversation he had laid out sharply broken off; thus Saul had done his duty to family-affairs. The further express statement that he said nothing to his uncle *of the kingdom, of which Samuel had spoken to him*, is to be referred, not to Saul's unassuming humility (Keil), or modesty (Ewald), or prudence (Then)., or apprehension of his uncle's incredulity and envy, but to the fact that Samuel, by his manner of imparting the divine revelation, had clearly and expressly given him to understand (ix. 25-27) that it was meant in the first instance for him alone, and that it was not the divine will that he should share it with others. The public presentation of Saul as the king of Israel, *whom God had chosen*, was to take place only at the time appointed by God through Samuel, and at the place which the prophet should determine. Saul may have thought, too, that his uncle's ears were not entitled to be the first recipients of so holy a message, he having got his rights on the question concerning the asses.

III. *The choice of Saul by lot as public confirmation of the divine election already made in secret.* Vers. 17-21.

Ver. 17. The *popular assembly*, called by Samuel at *Mizpah*, because this sacred place was connected in the people's minds with the memory of the great victory, ch. vii., was intended, as is shown by the expression "to Jehovah" (see vii. 5), solemnly to confirm and ratify the divine choice of Saul to be king of Israel, and to consecrate him to this office. Nägelsbach (Herz. *R.-E.*, XIII. 401), referring to ver. 8, objects that the next meeting was not in Gilgal, but in Mizpah, and that, according to xi. 14, Saul goes to Gilgal not *before* but *with* Samuel, and there could, therefore, be no question of waiting for him. The objection is, however, set aside by the remark that these two meetings in Mizpah and Gilgal have nothing to do with vers. 7, 8, but are designed, as is expressly said, to announce Saul as the chosen of the Lord, and again to confirm him as king (ver. 24 and xi. 14), *in order that, as universally recognized king, he might, from Gilgal, that ancient classic ground, take in hand the great work of delivering Israel from the Philistines, which, as his primary task, lay ready to his hand* (ver. 7: "whatever thy hand findeth").

Vers. 18, 19. *Samuel's introductory discourse.* The "*thus saith the Lord,*" answers to the "to the Lord" of ver. 17. The people were called to assemble before the Lord to hear His word through the mouth of Samuel, as the latter had received it directly from the Lord. Samuel's discourse *first* sets before the people in curt, vigorous phrase the royal deeds of might which God the Lord had done for them: *the conduction from Egypt, the deliverance out of the hand of the Egyptians* (immediately after the exodus) *and the deliverance out of the hand of all the kingdoms which had oppressed them.* Cleric.: "The history of which last deliverances is contained in the Book of Judges." * This third period of the history embraces the whole time from the conquest of Canaan to the present, including the victory at Mizpah (vii. 5), of which the stone before their eyes bore witness. The reference to the *kingdoms*, from which God had delivered Israel is noteworthy, because, after the pattern of *these* very kingdoms, the Israelites wished to have a king and an outward kingdom. There is in this a factual irony.—Ver. 19. The *second* part of the discourse: the *charge of ingratitude and unfaithfulness*, expressed in the demand

* The masc. Partcp. הַלֹּחֲצִים ["which oppressed"] forms with the fem. subst. הַמַּמְלָכוֹת ["the kingdoms"] *a constructio ad sensum*, the warriors of the heathen nations being had in mind.

of a king. Their fault consisted not in the simple desire for a king, but in the fact that, forgetting God's royal achievements, they wished to have a visible mighty king like the heathen nations, and, not seeking help from oppressive enemies from the Lord, they desired a human king along with God, or instead of their invisible King as helper out of all need and oppression.—It is to be noted that the "*and ye*" at the beginning of the second part [ver. 19] answers to the "*I*" at the beginning of the first part [ver. 18], marking emphatically the contrast between the Lord's powerful help and the people's sinful conduct in this question of a king.—The *contempt* or *rejection* of Jehovah (comp. Expos. on viii. 7 sq.) consisted, in respect to God's gracious and mighty deliverances, in the demand: *set a king over us.** After this sharp rebuke, in which (as before in chap. viii.) the full significance of their desire from the religious-ethical point of view is held up before the people, follows *thirdly* the factual *granting* of the desire, according to the divine command, viii. 22, by *ordering* a choice by the sacred lot. The "and now," in respect to the "I—ye" contrasted above, marks a division in the address. The *manner of choice* is enjoined with precision by Samuel. They are to appear "*before Jehovah;*" this refers not merely to the conception of God as everywhere present (Cleric.: "when invoked, He was present with the assembly"), but also to the *holy place* in which the Lord's altar was erected (vii. 9). They were to appear by *tribes* and *thousands*, the latter here meaning the same thing as *families* (מִשְׁפָּחוֹת). To facilitate legal transactions Moses had divided the people into thousands, hundreds, *etc.*, and appointed captains over all these divisions (Ex. xviii. 25). This division probably followed as closely as possible the natural one, and so the designation *thousands* was used as synonymous with *families* (Num. i. 16; x. 4; Josh. xxii. 14, *etc.*), because the number of heads of houses in the several families of a tribe might easily reach a thousand (comp. ver. 21).—Ver. 20 sq. *Execution* and *result* of this mode of election. The representatives of the tribes being called, the lot fell on the tribe of *Benjamin*, (properly the tribe "was taken"). *How* the lots were cast is not said; commonly it was by *throwing* tablets (Josh. xviii. 6, 8; Jon. i. 7; Ezek. xxiv. 7), but sometimes by *drawing* from a vessel (Num. xxxiii. 54; Lev. vi. 9). The latter seems to have been the method here employed. There is not the slightest ground for connecting this with the lot of the high-priestly Urim and Thummim (Vaihinger in Herz. *R.-E.* IV. 85).—Ver. 21. When the families of the tribe of Benjamin were called, the lot fell on the family of *Matri*,† an otherwise unknown name (Ew. III. 33 conjectures that it is corrupted from *Bikri*†). In the *families* the lot was usually so conducted that the *houses* (בָּתִּים) were next called (Josh. vii. 14), then the *patroæ* or father-house (בֵּית־אָב) thus chosen the individual heads of families (גְּבָרִים) came forward, that the family and the individual chosen by the Lord might be indicated (see Keil *in loco*, *Rem.* 1). Here the description of the election is abridged, the last steps being passed over (comp. what is said above on the three signs). The result is given at once: **And Saul was taken**. The insertion of the Sept. "and they present the family of *Matri* by men" is to be regarded (with Keil, against Then.) as an interpretation of the Alexandrian translators. According to the order above-stated (from Josh. vii. 14) it fills out the supposed gap in the text not completely, but only partially and erroneously.—**They sought Saul, but found him not.** The ground was his diffidence and shyness in respect to appearing publicly before the whole people. Nägelsbach rightly remarks (Herz., "*Saul*," p. 433), that his hiding behind the baggage during the election is not in conflict with the account of his change of mind. "At so decisive a moment, which turns the eyes of all on *one* with the most diverse feelings, the heart of the most courageous man may well beat." The situation, along with an element bordering on the comic, has a serious significance and a deep psychological truth.

IV. *Saul declared king; the partial homage.* Vers. 22-27.

Ver. 22. *Inquiry of the Lord and divine answer* in respect to the failure to find Saul. *To inquire of the Lord* (xxii. 10; xxiii. 9 sq.; xxviii. 6; xxx. 7 sq.; 2 Sam. ii. 1; Num. xxvii. 21; Judg. i. 1; xx. 27) is to ask for the divine decision in individual matters of private or (as here) public importance for the theocratic congregation, by *Urim* and *Thummim.* [For a case of personal inquiry in premosaic times, see Gen. xxv. 22.—Tr.]. Though the latter is not here expressly mentioned, its presence must be assumed according to Ex. xxviii. 30, it being inseparably connected with the high-priestly *Ephod*, in the *Choshen* of which (breastplate with twelve precious stones and the name of the twelve tribes) it was placed. The *inquiry* of *Jehovah* by this means was, it is true, according to Ex. xxviii. and Num. xxvii., to be made by the high-priest. We cannot, however, suppose that this was done here, for the high-priest's office was vacant; some other, not Samuel, who presided over the assembly and the election, but a priest, in the high-priestly robes, conducted the solemn inquiry, which was exclusively the privilege of the priests. It must be looked on as a different act from the preceding casting of lots.—The question was: **Has any one else come hither?** that is, besides those here present, among whom Saul was not to be found. The "one" (lit. "man") refers to the *one* who could not be found; the oracle is to give information as to his presence or absence. The Sept. and Vulg. have: "will the man yet come hither?" and Then. alters the text accordingly, against which Keil rightly remarks: "it was unnecessary to inquire of God whether Saul would yet come; he might have been sent for without more ado."—The answer is: **Behold, he is there**, hid among the baggage. The Pron. "he" (הוּא) does not require a preceding "*the man*" (Then.), but relates to the person referred to in, or giving oc-

* The כִּי is "used to introduce direct discourse, even in a contradictory clause, like our 'no, but,' as in Ruth i. 10" (Keil). It is therefore not necessary to read לֹא with the ancient vers. for לוֹ, which reading is obviously imitated from viii. 19 and xii. 12.

† [Properly: Matrites and Bikrites.—Tr.]

casion to the question, and to whom the procedure referred. "Stuff" (σκευή, vasa), baggage, which must have been extensive in such an assembly. As Saul had the assurance that he was the king chosen by God, his behavior here could not signify that he wished to evade the acceptance of the kingdom, but must be referred to overpowering diffidence, in view of the grand preparations of the election and the divine decision which had laid so mighty a grasp on his life, and to "anxious consideration of the awfully important consequences of his appearance" (Ew.).—With this view the remark of Clericus may be considered to accord: "Saul, informed beforehand by Samuel of what would be done, seems to have hidden himself, that he might not appear to have solicited the royal dignity, and to have come to Mizpah to gain the popular vote for himself."—In the beginning of ver. 23 the *three* consecutive *verbs* give a quick and lively coloring to the whole process of fetching Saul from his *purposely* sought-out hiding-place. His *magnificent stature* (ix. 2), as outward-physical qualification for the kingdom, very imposing to the people, is here again expressly mentioned (εἶδος ἄξιον τυραννίδος, Eurip. in Grotius). In accordance with the people's receptivity for so imposing and kingly an appearance, Samuel closes the solemn election with the words (ver. 24): **See ye him whom the Lord has chosen?** by which he expressly declares the *election* by lot to be a *confirmation* of the previous divine choice, and completes the formal *presentation* of Saul as the divinely-appointed king, and then adds as *proof:* **For there is none like him in all the people.** There are *two factors* which, according to this account, co-operated to call forth the people's cry of *salutation* and *homage:* **May the king live!** The *testimony of Samuel:* "This is the king chosen by the Lord," granted in spite of the fact that their demand, proceeding from a vain, haughty, and unfaithful mind, was not well-pleasing to him, and the immediate *impression* made by *Saul's person*, which was in keeping with the kingly dignity.

Ver. 25. **The manner of the kingdom.** Samuel is said to have done *three* things in connection with this constitution: 1) he set it before the people; 2) he wrote it in a book; 3) he laid it up before the Lord.—The "*law of the kingdom*," which Samuel presented to the people, is, as appears from the context, one which has not yet been *written*. It is to be distinguished from the "*manner of the king*" (viii. 11 sqq.) in which Samuel set before the people the usurpation of an unrestricted arbitrary rule, such as existed among the heathen nations whose monarchical constitution Israel envied. In content it was no doubt essentially the same with the law of the king in Deut. xvii. 14–20, especially vers. 19, 20, and therefore related to the divinely established rights and duties of the theocratic king, the fulfilment of which the people were authorized to demand from him. God's purpose is to rule the people through Him as His organ. The "right [or manner] of the kingdom' is therefore, this being its theocratic ground and aim, not a *capitulation* (Michaelis) between the king (that is, here Samuel) and the people or the first example of a *constitutional monarchy* (Then.); for the restraints, which are here set on the kingly power, are not imposed by the demands of the people, or by a partition of power between king and people, and not by a contract or agreement between the two as parties, but are given in the divine *Law*, in the already existing *theocratic right* of the theocracy, in which the absolute monarchy of the divine will is to rule and reign over king and people, both together.—Samuel *wrote* this law of the kingdom in a *book*. We find here the first trace, after the written records of Moses, of writing among the prophets, long before the literary activity to which we owe what we now have, and essentially also the spoken prophecies with the historical notices pertaining to them—the beginning of a literature, which was exclusively in the service of the theocratic spirit, and, when it appeared soon after this in the so-called Schools of the Prophets, made its first task the theocratic writing of history.—**He laid it up before the Lord.** Where and how? The supposition that it was deposited in the Tabernacle at Shiloh contradicts the context, from which it appears that the deposition was made in the place where the announcement took place. The expression "before the Lord" leaves the manner undetermined, and indicates merely the solemn and formal deposition and preservation of the writing, as sacred original documentary record of the establishment and regulation of the theocratic kingdom, in a safe place *before the Lord*, whose presence was symbolically represented partly by the holy priestly vestment, partly by the altar to which the people approached, and in connection therewith had here its *local* representation even without tabernacle and ark, though we know not in what manner.—Notwithstanding this public and solemn investment of Saul with the royal dignity and authority, Samuel continues to be the highest director of the affairs of the people; *the now established kingdom retires passively into the background before Samuel's Prophetic-Judicial Office, which retains its full activity and authority.* This is indicated by the fact that it is not Saul, but Samuel that finally *dismisses the people*, an act which involves the formal closing by him of the assembly.

Vers. 26, 27. *Saul's behavior after his installation as king, and the behavior of the people towards him.* **And Saul also went home to Gibeah.** Clericus hence infers that the Philistines had no military post at Gibeah, since they would not have permitted Israel to have a king in opposition to their authority; but the objection vanishes when we reflect that, the Philistines being few in number and at a distance from the place of election, the meaning of the event might easily have been concealed from them, at least for the short time till the battle of ch. xi. during which Saul remained quietly at home, especially as such great religious assemblies at Samuel's instance were not infrequent and could not appear strange to the Philistines, and Saul had returned to his ordinary occupations in the field.—The *conduct of the people* towards Saul as king is *twofold*. On one side he receives friendly recognition with willingness to serve him [**and there went with him the company of valiant men**]. The Sept. and Then. read: "There went sons of strength, whose hearts God had touched, with Saul;" but this is suspicious as being apparently

a conformity to the following "sons of wickedness," interpreting the somewhat strange word "valiant company" (חַיִל) by the ordinary periphrasis "sons of strength" (בְּנֵי־חַיִל), as in 1 Kings i. 52. The word (חיל) is found alone with similar meaning "host" (in Pharaoh's retinue) in Ex. xiv. 28; here it means "valiant company," but with allusion to the "power" which Saul as king might build up from such valiant men as those who now formed the escort of honor. **Whose hearts God had touched**; that is, to show themselves so faithful and willing in service and obedience. This faithfulness and willingness to serve, shown in their escorting Saul, sprang from their *hearts*, the deepest base and centre of their inner life; but it was in this case an *effect* of the immediate influence of the Spirit of God, who sanctifies and rules the heart even in respect to moral deportment towards His constituted authorities. But not irresistibly. In ver. 27 we find an organized opposition to God's established kingdom, whose representative Saul was. Whether *envy* and *jealousy* produced it (Then.) is not said. The opposition are called "worthless people" (בְּנֵי בְלִיַּעַל). They are people who 1) haughtily and contemptuously nullified beforehand the *wholesomeness* and *utility* of Saul's royal government for the people in their depressed condition,—the question "What will the man help us?" expresses hostility to and contempt for Saul's kingship as a completely aimless and useless institution; 2) they exhibited decided "contempt" for his *fitness* for the office, and attacked his personal honor; 3) they did not show *submission* to his rule, "brought him no present" as sign of reverence, obedience, and obligation to provide for his maintenance; for freewill-gifts from the people were a part of the regular revenue of princes.—Clericus: "Therefore others, who thought better of his election, brought him gifts, that he might maintain the royal dignity without disgrace." *Saul's conduct towards these enemies:* **he was as a deaf man**; that is, he acted as if he heard nothing; "he left those men's contempt unnoticed" (Cler.). This shows *self-control* and *self-denial*, but also great *foresight* and *prudence;* for though Saul had had the right, notwithstanding his and Samuel's purpose that he should remain in private life awhile, to proceed vigorously against this mean insult to his person and office, yet such a course might have prejudiced his position among and towards the people; and all the more, if the open opposers, as Nägelsbach conjectures (Herz. XIII., 433), belonged "to the princes of the larger and hitherto controlling tribes of Judah and Ephraim, who were dissatisfied with the election of an obscure Benjaminite," in which case, still more imbittered by Saul's resolution to punish them, they could have made their influence still more widely felt against him.—As to the construction it is to be remarked with *Keil* on וַיֵּלְכוּ (ver. 26) and וַיְהִי (ver. 27) that in both cases "the Imperf. with Waw Consec. forms the apodosis to a preceding adjective-clause as protasis," and the sequence of clauses in German [and English, Tr.] would be: "When Saul also went home . . . . . there went with him . . . ., and when worthless people said . . . . . he was as a deaf person."

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

See the remarks in the Exegetical exposition. In addition to these:

1. *Anointing with oil* as a sacred, theocratic usage is the symbol of introduction into the fellowship and service of the Spirit of God, as is clear from xvi. 13 sq.; Isa. lx. 1 sq. It was employed 1) in connection with the tabernacle and "all that was in it," that is, its furniture (Ex. xxix. 36; xxx. 26–30; xl. 9–13; Lev. viii. 10–12; Num. vii. 1), and in these lifeless objects (which are said to be "sanctified") denotes their separation from everything unclean and unholy, and their consecration to the holy end for which they were designed, namely, to be instruments of God's Holy Spirit for acting on His people. So it is said especially of the altar of burnt-offering, Ex. xl. 10: "and it shall be most holy," because as the place of expiation, it was the holiest object in the court; 2) in connection with *persons*, who are called to theocratical service and office, anointing is the symbol of the impartation of God's Spirit, and the equipment with His gifts and powers as indispensable condition of the right theocratic exercise of the office. Hitherto confined to sanctuary and priests, it now appears as the consecration to the *theocratic office of king*, and denotes here the impartation of the powers of light and life from the Spirit of God, as possessor of which the king is henceforth called by excellence the Anointed of the Lord, and is alone authorized to exercise the theocratic rule in the name of the Lord, the invisible King. The "coming of the Spirit of God" on Saul and David is the consequence of their anointing, or answers to the significance of its symbolism. The natural basis for this symbolism of oil is its power to dispense light and life, joy and healing, by which it sets forth the Spirit's dispensation of *light* and *life* and the therein-contained gifts and powers (Bähr, *Symb.* II., 173). And in the historical development of the theocracy and of the divine revelations which point to the perfecting and fulfilment of the theocracy in the New Covenant, the symbolic anointing of theocratic *kings*, *priests*, and *prophets* (comp. 1 Ki. xix. 15, 16) as sign of the impartation of the Spirit of God and its powers is the type, that is, the historical foretokening and prefiguring of the anointing with the Spirit without measure (John iii. 34) and with the spirit of might (Acts x. 38), by which Jesus was "the Christ," the Anointed of God for the New-Testamental kingdom of God, first as King of His kingdom, and then as chief Prophet and Priest. Samuel's word: "*The Lord* hath anointed thee," signifies that God Himself, of His free grace, dispenses the powers and gifts of His Spirit, when He calls to an office in His kingdom and service.

2. The greatness and glory of the royal office consisted essentially in the fact that he who filled it was "*Prince over the inheritance or possession of Jehovah.*" The foundation for this view is the inward life-fellowship into which God has so entered with Israel by His self-revelation, that they *have* Him as their God, as their highest good and possession; Ex. xx. 2: "I am the Lord, *thy God.*" God is thus the *possession* of His *people*, and of every *individual godly man*, Ps. xvi. 5;

cxlii. 6; cxix. 57; Jer. x. 16; li. 19. Conversely the people of Israel is the *property* (סְגֻלָּה) of its God, or His inheritance (נַחֲלָה), 1) by reason of its *election* out of *all other peoples*, Ex. xix. 5; 2) by reason of the wonderful *deliverance* out of *Egypt*, Ex. xix. 4; Deut. iv. 20; ix. 29; 3) by reason of the *covenant* at Sinai, Ex. xix. 5; 4) by reason of the constant *manifestations of grace and salvation* (Ps. xxviii. 9; 2 Sam. xiv. 16; xxi. 3), among which the forgiveness of sins is the greatest, Ex. xxxiv. 9. The New Covenant presents the fulfillment and completion of this relation in the λάος περιούσιος ["peculiar people," that is, God's own property] Tit. ii. 14; 1 Pet. ii. 9.

3. The *three signs* which, in accordance with Samuel's prophetic announcement, were given to Saul, signify *in the first place* in *general* the *assurance* given him (by events apparently accidental, yet ordered to this end by God) of His divine *appointment* to the royal office and his qualification for it, and of the fact that *the Lord would therein be with him.* In the lives of those who desire to serve God in faithful obedience, even the simplest and apparently most accidental events must go to confirm the assurance that all things work together for good to them that serve God, and to confirm their confidence in His providence that works in detached, seemingly insignificant circumstances, and His faithfulness that lasts through life.—*Severally,* however, these three signs indicate so many *principal stations* in the *development of Saul's inner life,* and in an advancing line from the ass-driver to the "prince of the inheritance of God." These are divinely-ordered facts, each of which has two meanings for Saul; first a factual revelation or instruction from God for the present moment, and then a prefigurative relation to the future administration of his royal office. The *first occurrence,* the meeting with two men who inform him that the asses are found, frees his heart from the pressure of little, earthly, everyday cares, and instructs him henceforth, free from the concerns of the lower, material life, to direct his inner life to the lofty aims and duties of his theocratic calling. Once for all the petty earthly is to find for him its quietus. Inwardly free and consecrated to the Lord alone, he is to pursue his way *upward.* The *second sign:* three men going up to *Bethel* offer him two of the three *sacrificial loaves.* This gift is the factual homage paid him by a royal offering, and betokens for the future his royal position in which to him, along with sanctuary and priests, the wealth of the land will be offered as tribute. The *third event* directs Saul's look from this kingly power to the highest conditions of a right theocratic administration, which he receives through impartation of the Spirit of God and His gifts. In the company of prophets by the Spirit which comes on him, he receives the gift of prophecy and that equipment of his inner life with the powers of the divine Spirit by which he becomes another man and receives a new heart. In this there is also for the future the warning that it is only under the guidance of God's Spirit, in the absolute *obedience* of his will to the divine will, rooted in a *heart* new-created, changed by the Holy Ghost and sanctified, that he can fulfil his calling so as to secure the welfare of God's inheritance and the approbation of the Lord. So, while outwardly wandering from place to place, and coming home at last, Saul rises inwardly from the cares of a lower earthly calling to the lofty tasks of the highest office of the theocracy in which he is to gain for his people the holiest possessions—from a low and common sphere of life to a free broad view that embraces all Israel—from a soul entangled in the natural and earthly to the experience of thorough renewal of heart and change of mind—from a low and narrow wealth, wherein he seeks satisfaction, to the possession of the highest and holiest gift, the Spirit of God—from a profane, godless life, to the most intimate fellowship with God through the mediation of the Spirit. This career and leading of Saul is a type of the Lord's leadings which all experience who give themselves up to His guidance that they may be called by Him for His kingdom and its service. The change of the natural man, the renewal of the inner life from the heart out showed itself, indeed, in the Old-Testamental point of view, partially and sporadically; but at the same time it was also only a thing postulated, desiderated, promised, and as such is most clearly expressed in Ps. li. 12–14; Jer. xxxi.; Ez. xxxvi.; the complete fulfillment was possible only in the New-Testamental kingdom of God through the *new birth* by the Spirit of God which in all its fulness was first imparted by Christ and went out from Christ, John iii. [Because of the difference in force and extent of the expression "new heart" in the Old and New Testaments, we must guard against supposing in Saul so radical a change as Dr. Erdmann seems disposed to assume. In the Old Test. conception any endowment, spiritual, mental or physical, which connects itself with faith in God, is regarded as the product of the Spirit of God (see the history of Samson and the Judges generally, and Balaam), and a divine influence which leads a man to sing the praises of God, as Saul did here, is not necessarily the creative touch which regenerates the soul. In an important sense Saul was a changed man, and received a new heart, in the elevation of his aims and his upward striving to God; but his after-life shows that this impulse towards the divine, given in mercy by the divine Spirit, was damped and finally destroyed by the opposing force of his worldliness and self-seeking. His heart, so we must conclude from the teachings of Scripture, was touched and roused, but not new-created.—Tr.]

4. It is noteworthy for the significance of this crisis in the life of Saul as well as in the history of the kingdom of God in Israel, that these *three facts,* so important for the establishment of the kingdom and the calling of Saul, occur *at or not far from holy places,* which were of great importance for the history of Israel. *Rachel's grave* must have reminded Saul how here, by the birth of Benjamin, which cost his ancestress her life, was laid the foundation of the greatness to which this smallest tribe was raised by his election as king. The ancient *Bethel* carried him back to the time when God's revelation to Jacob strengthened the foundation of the theocracy which was laid in Abraham's call and the promises given him, and renewed the promise made to the patriarchs; in the sanctuary there Saul sees the sign of the covenant-faithfulness of the God of Abra-

ham, Isaac and Jacob. *Gibeah* and its neighboring height was a place consecrated to sacrifice and prayer, and especially important because the dwelling-place or pilgrimage-shrine of a community of prophets. Here flourishes prophecy, which in Samuel prepares the way for the kingdom, and guides it on the way; here rules the mighty prophetic spirit, which lays hold on Saul, and which he receives with its gifts. The holy places, in and near which Saul receives the three signs, are, in respect to their significance for his calling to the royal office, *the historically holy ground.* "This is as little accidental as the belief, so often expressed in the Psalter, that help comes from the holy place; and the central country, the tribes of Benjamin and Ephraim, whither Saul's steps now lead him, is especially rich in such holy places" (Ew. III. 30).

5. *For the development of prophecy* in the time just before the rise of the theocratic kingdom the history in this section is important in several respects. We here meet for the first time a *prophetic fraternity,* which is not an accidental assemblage, but a connected, united community. Its members are called "prophets;" to their designation *Nebiim* (נְבִיאִים ["prophets," taken to be from a verb meaning "to gush forth"]) answers the inspired outstreaming of praise to God in testimony of His deeds of grace; the bond that unites them is the Spirit of God, who fills them and impels them to such inspired utterances; their inner unity and fellowship shows itself, it is probable, already in a *common abode* and like manner of life. It is an association of prophetical men, representing both the prophetic calling and office (*munus*), and the prophetic gift (*donum*), that is, prophecy not of the nature of a calling and office. Whatever may have been the numerical strength of this prophetic element in the people, it is certain from this narrative that the Spirit of the Lord showed itself alive in individual circles of the national life, and freely and mightily unfolded its powers and gifts. A pre-indication of this is found in the incident recorded in Num. xi. 26 sq., where the Spirit of the Lord freely and independently of institutions exhibited its awakening and vitalizing power, outside of the circle of Elders gathered around Moses at the Tabernacle, in the camp of the people, and when Joshua contended that Moses' official authority was the only proper medium of the divine Spirit, Moses rebuked him with the words: "Enviest thou for my sake? I would that *all Jehovah's people* were prophets, that Jehovah would put his Spirit upon them!" In the *rise of the prophets* of Samuel's time we see a fulfillment of the promise contained in Moses' exclamation, a sign of the new spiritual life of faith aroused in the people, a type of the outpouring of the Spirit on all flesh, which is prophesied of in Joel iii. [ii. 28], and is set forth in the New Covenant as factual condition of the universal priesthood, limited only by the working of God's Spirit, and as final revelation of the living God. Further, in these prophetic communities, whether they were from the beginning firmly organized or free associations, we see the *unifying, associative power* of the prophetic spirit over against the disruption of the theocratic and religious life which was the legacy of the time of the Judges. The company descending from the high-place at Gibeah, which Saul joined, shows that in these bodies there were *common religious* exercises. However these associations arose through the associative impulse of the awakened higher life—whether Samuel founded them or not is uncertain, the latter is more probable; but after their establishment he took them under his care, and later gave them a firmer form and government (see ch. xix. and what is there said at greater length of the schools of the prophets)—they were, by their concentrated power of religious life, light and salt for the popular life, and diffused around them the influences of the Spirit that filled them. An indication of this is the power of the Spirit by which Saul was laid hold of (in his third sign) after his meeting with those men. But this new Spirit-born life has its contrast always in a lower, sensuous life, disinclined to the joyous abandon and the holy uprising towards God. The wondering question: "Is Saul also among the prophets?" points to such a contrast, in which the worldly-minded, strangers to the life in the Spirit of the Lord, stand opposed to the members of the prophetic Union, just as to-day the children of the world, despising the guidance of the Spirit from above, set themselves with contempt or reviling over against living Christians, the "pietists and godly."

The *prophetic inspiration* is characteristically delineated in these occurrences. Its *essence* consists in such an entrance of the Spirit of God into the inner life of the prophet, that the latter is thereby mightily laid hold of and lifted up into the condition of ecstatic ravishment. As a *vehicle* of this spiritual excitation appears here instrumental and vocal *music* which, on the physical-psychical side, gives freer play to the feelings aroused by the divine Spirit. The prophetic inspiration takes the musical art into its service. If ver. 5 says nothing special as to the relation of music to the prophetic utterance, it yet shows that music was *practiced* in the prophetic communities. In its *origin* the prophetic inspiration shows itself as a sudden thing which gets the mastery of the man's subjective state; the Spirit of God "comes upon" Saul; we trace it as a controlling power in vers. 6, 10; xix. 20; Mic. iii. 8. The *utterance* of this inspiration, the "prophesying," is impassioned address or inspired song, and has an *enkindling,* sweeping power. It is, however, only a *momentary,* not a continuous thing. As the seventy-two elders prophesied once, and not again, so also Saul here among the prophets. The spring of the Spirit is an intermitting one, because, according to the nature of the Old Covenant, though there might be various grades of individual powerful inworkings, there could not be a permanent indwelling of the Spirit of God in the heart of man.* The indispensable *condition* of the prophetic inspiration and of prophesying as a genuine life-utterance of the Spirit from above is a mind directed to the living God,

* [The author seems here to confound the special and the ordinary influence of the Holy Spirit. Then, as now, there were differences of spiritual power at different times; but there seems to be no good reason for not believing that the Holy Spirit dwelt just as really and permanently, though not so distinctly, in all God's people under the Old Covenant as under the New. —Tr.]

the *religious-ethical disposition of heart* well-pleasing to him, such as Saul had received by the Lord's leadings, he going obediently and humbly in the ways appointed him. Comp. ver. 9: "God gave him *another heart*," with ver. 10: "the *Spirit of God* came upon him, and he *prophesied* in their midst."

6. "God gave him another *heart*," comp. ver. 9 with ver. 6 and Deut. v. 26 [29]: "O that they had such a *heart* to fear me." "Therefore the working of revelation is directed to renewing man from the heart, and its aim is, by a divine salvation, to destroy the unreceptiveness (the stupidity in which the soul's centre labors, as Roos expresses it, *Fund. psychol. ex sacr. script.*, 1769, p. 153) and the opposition of the heart (the circumcision of the heart, Deut. xxx. 6), to put the fear of God into the heart (Jer. xxxii. 40), and so make the law an inward thing (Jer. xxxi. 33). This is effected by the divine Spirit which, even under the Old Covenant, making prophets by change of heart into other men (1 Sam. x. 6, 9), and causing the pious to experience His power, that purifies the heart and brings it into accord with God's law (Ps. li. 12–14), thus points to the new creation of the heart on the plane of completed salvation, Ezek. xxxvi. 26 sq.; xi. 19." Oehler *s. v. Herz*, Herzog, *R. E.*

7. *The two elections of king;* ix. 1—x. 16 and x. 17-27. *Saul's call* to the royal office consists in *two consecutive acts:* 1) in the section ix. 1—x. 16 is related how Saul is *personally* called *in secret*, consecrated by anointing, and by the three signs assured that he is the king of Israel called by the Lord. Here the divine factor, as the only effective one, appears in the foreground; 2) in x. 17–27 is related the *public election* of Saul by *lot* by a *popular assembly* called for that purpose by Samuel "to the Lord." Here the human factor appears in co-operation with the divine, and Samuel is their intermediator. There is no conflict between these two narratives. "Is then the divine instruction to Samuel to grant the people's demand and give them a king (ch. viii.) and the revelation that Saul was the man selected by Jehovah, together with the anointing of Saul (ix. 1—x. 16) irreconcilable with his choice by lot?—That a prophet carries out unconditionally the will of God, even when it does not accord with his own views, and leaves the decision of the lot to the control of God, involves neither a tempting of God nor a piece of jugglery" (Keil, *Introd.* I., 235; the latter part against Thenius). By the *lot*, as means of direct divine decision, Saul, already in secret called to be king, was as such *openly* before the whole people to receive solemn divine legitimation. Similarly in Aaron's case, Numb. xvii. Besides the two principal stations of the road on which Saul is led by God through Samuel into the kingdom, Ramah and Mizpah, between which Rachel's grave, Deborah's oak and Gibeah are important intermediate stations, there is yet a third, Gilgal, chap. xi. Here the kingdom is renewed to him, here he first finds undivided, universal recognition as king of Israel, having once more received the divine legitimation by a victory over the enemy. We find here a gradation in the occurrences, each of which contains a new moment, and none of which has anything that excludes or contradicts the others.

8. *The twofold law of the king*, viii. 11–18 and x. 25. These two are mutually exclusive. The former (viii.) is that which is historically necessary from the heathen point of view, *the consequence of the demand to have a king like the kings of the nations;* the latter (x.) is the ideal theocratic law of the king, which corresponds to the call of the covenant-people, and, as an outflow from the holy will of the covenant God, is the limit and norm of the royal government. The former sprang from the sinful self-will of men, the latter is the absolute dominion of the divine will. Saul's call and election was to be completed in his attestation after the norm of this law of the kingdom.

9. The *position of prophecy* towards the newly-established kingdom is a controlling, regulating, norm-giving one. Samuel's conduct towards Saul on his entrance upon the theocratic royal calling prefigures the position which prophecy was henceforth to occupy alongside of the kingdom. "That the law of the king should not be a dead letter, that royal self-will should be kept within bounds, was to be the care not of a representative popular assembly, but of prophecy, which stood as theocratic watchman by the side of royalty." Oehler, *s. v. König* in Herz. *R. E.* VI. 12.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Chap. IX. 27; X. 1. *How the Lord fits His chosen ones for the kingly calling in His kingdom:* 1) By quiet instruction by means of *His word* He brings them into a right knowledge of the tasks He assigns; 2) By the anointing of *His Spirit* He imparts to them the needful power and strength therefor; 3) By the production of *infallible signs* He gives them a just certainty and joyous confidence. [Ver. 2, latter part, *Scott:* A superior *care*, in common life, swallows up an inferior one; and the tender parent ceases from anxiety about his property, when solicitous for the welfare of his son. . . . . And so, a due concern about eternal things would moderate our care about the interests of this life.—Tr.].

Vers. 2–9. *The signs of divine guidance along the paths of human life on earth*, how they 1) *Pointing backwards*, remind us of the manifestations of grace in past times (the holy places); 2) *Pointing upwards*, admonish us to lift up the heart from worthless, earthly things to higher good; 3) *Pointing forwards*, demand a new life in the Spirit, and 4) call on us to *look into our own heart*, while for the work of renewal of the whole man they promise the gifts and powers of the Spirit from above.

The appearance of special divine signs in human life: 1) *Whence coming?* a) *Ordered* in time by God's wise Providence, not springing from chance, not *aimless;* b) *Decreed* in his eternal purpose, not accidental, not *groundless;* c) *Sent* as messengers of His holy and gracious will, not *meaningless.* 2) *To whom applying?* a) To him who lets himself be *guided* by God; b) To him who *holds still* when God is guiding him, and c) To him who lets God *speak to Him* by His word. 3) *What signifying?* a) *Reminding* of the saving and gracious presence of God (partly in the past, partly in the present: "God is with thee"); b) *Pointing* to our *tasks*, which under the guidance of the

Lord are to be fulfilled (vers. 7, 8); c) *Exhorting* to a renewal of the whole inner life through the power of the Holy Ghost (comp. vers. 6, 9). [Ver. 5. Music as a means of religious exaltation. Comp. 2 Kings iii. 15; 1 Cor. xiv. 26-33; Eph. v. 18.—TR.].

Vers. 6-9. *The transforming effects of the Spirit of God.* 1) Out of the old heart He creates a new man. 2) Out of dumb people He makes prophets. 3) To the weak He lends power and strength for a great work. 4) Remoteness from God He changes into the most intimate communion with God.—Vers. 6, 9. *The Spirit of the Lord will come upon thee!* 1) A *great word of promise*, which applies to *every one* that is called to the kingdom of God. 2) A *wonderful event* of the inner life, which occurs and is experienced only under definite *conditions.* 3) The *beginning of a new life*, which takes place by the change of the heart. [Ver. 6. Prophesying not a certain proof of piety. Comp. Balaam, Caiaphas (John xi. 51), and the "many" in Matt. vii. 22.—TR.].

Ver. 7. *The great word, "God is with thee!"* 1) The *infallible signs*, which assure us of it. 2) The *consoling strength*, which the heart thereby receives. 3) The *mighty impulse* to do according to God's good pleasure, which lies therein. 4.) The *earnest exhortation* which is thereby given, in all the occurrences of human life, to mark the will of the Lord therein made known.

Ver. 9. *The new heart a gift of God.* 1) Through *human* proclamations of the divine word *the renewal of the heart* is only *prepared for.* 2) But through the *divine act* of the Holy Spirit working through the word it is effected, and 3) It is *accompanied* by infallible signs of the manifestations of divine grace. [HENRY: He has no longer the heart of a husbandman, ... concerned only about his corn and cattle; but the heart of a statesman, a general, a prince. Whom God calls to service He will make fit for it. If He advance to another station, He will give another heart, to those who sincerely desire to serve Him with their power.—TR.].

Ver. 10. *The power of communion in the Lord:* 1) *Inwardly* it unites the members closely together, a) into an inward confederacy of love in the Lord, b) into harmonious praise of the Lord; 2) *Outwardly* it exercises a controlling and contagious influence: a) so that a way is made for the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of others, and b) so that like effects of the Spirit are manifested in others also.

Vers. 7-12. *The beginning of a new life in the Spirit:* 1) *Naturally prepared for* and indicated beforehand through signs given by God (vers. 7, 9); 2) *Supernaturally effected* through the power of the Holy Spirit (ver. 10); 3) *Inwardly consisting* in the renewal of the heart (ver. 9); 4) *Outwardly manifesting itself* in the fruits (effects) of the Spirit (willing obedience to the Lord's command, patient waiting for the Lord's direction; joyful testimony to the Lord's grace). [It is not safe to treat this history as a case of true and thorough spiritual renewal, in any sense approaching the New Test. use of similar expressions. Comp. note of Tr. above in "Historical."—TR.].

Vers. 11, 12. *The question, "Is Saul also among the prophets?"* 1) A *cry of astonishment* by the world estranged from God, in which it speaks its own sentence; 2) A reliable *attestation* and *confirmation* of the miracle of the awaking to a new life for him in whom it has occurred; 3) A *factual proclamation of the honor of the Lord*, who by His Spirit creates such a transformation in man. [HENRY: Let not the worst be despaired of, yet let not an external show of devotion, and a sudden change for the present, be too much relied on; for Saul among the prophets, was Saul still.—TR.].

Vers. 13-16. *The art of testifying and being silent at the right time about the things of the kingdom of God:* 1) How it is to be *learned* in the school of the Holy Spirit (after Saul's example); 2) How it is to be *exercised* according to the company in which one finds himself (the inspired host of prophets—the profane uncle of Saul).

Vers. 17-19. *The mightiest means employed by the word of God to awaken true repentance:* 1) It *humbles* by *reminding* us of the manifestations of grace which without merit or worthiness we have experienced, in which the Lord has shown Himself our compassionate father (ver. 18). 2) It *rebukes* by *setting before* us our ingratitude and unfaithfulness, with which we have rewarded Him (ver. 19, "over us"), and 3) It *shames* us by *pointing* to the grace and faithfulness of God, which notwithstanding do not depart from us, in which He patiently condescends even to our sinful wishes and demands ("And now present yourselves before the Lord"—). Vers. 21-2. [He could not be found—hidden among the baggage. HENRY: So little fond was he now of that power, which yet, when he was in possession of, he could not without the utmost indignation think of parting with.... We may suppose he was at this time really averse to take upon him the government, 1. Because he was conscious to himself of unfitness for so great a trust. He had not been bred up to books, or arms, or courts, and feared he should be guilty of some fatal blunder. 2. Because it would expose him to the envy of his neighbors that were ill-affected towards him. 3. Because he understood by what Samuel had said, that the people sinned in asking a king, and it was in anger that God granted their request. 4. Because the affairs of Israel were at this time in a bad posture: the Philistines were strong, the Ammonites threatening, and he must be bold indeed, that will set sail in a storm.—TR.].

Vers. 20-27. *True humility and modesty:* 1) How it *roots* itself in a human heart touched by the Spirit of God; 2) How it *shows* itself, a) *before God* in the confession of unworthiness and unfitness for service in His kingdom, b) *before men* in reserve and silence; 3) How it is *crowned*, a) before God, with the *calling* to His service, b) before men, with the *approbation* of men's hearts which is wrought by God the Lord.

Vers. 24-27. *The divine choice and calling of a man to service in God's kingdom:* 1) It makes itself *known* in outward signs ("see ye," ver. 24); 2) It is *conditional* by the requisite natural gifts and properties ("that there is none like him," &c., ver. 24); 3) It *carries itself forward* by preparation from *above*, a) with the gifts and powers of the Spirit, b) through instruction in the will of God (ver. 25); 4) It *rises up* above the favor and disfavor of parties, in that it teaches us, a) to value human approbation as a gift of God (ver. 26), and

b) over against the hate and contempt of opposers to observe an humble silence before God.

J. DISSELHOFF, vers. 1-11. *The anointing to the office of king:* 1) On those who hold still before their God this anointing is *wrought*, really and truly, though at first in hope; 2) And although it is wrought only in hope, yet it is attested by divine signs following. THE SAME: vers. 7, 8, 13-27. *What the royal anointing gives, and what it demands:* 1) It makes the anointed one fit for all that his office lays upon him; 2) It demands that the anointed one should now do nothing more according to his own choice, but every thing according to the direction and will of God.

[Ver. 27. "And he was as though he were deaf." Notwithstanding they 1) questioned his capacity, 2) despised his power, 3) refused him homage and help (see Exegetical Notes), he was as though he were deaf, thereby showing 1) self-control, 2) prudence, 3) humility. Apply this to 1) public officers, 2) employers of servants or other subordinates, 3) persons in society, 4) church officials. There is a high sense in which *God* acts thus, and bad men imagine that He really is deaf (Ps. lxxiii. 11: xciv. 7; Job xxii. 13.—TR.]

THIRD SECTION.

Confirmation and General Recognition of the Kingdom under Saul.

CHAPS. XI. XII.

I. *Saul's Victory over the Ammonites.* Chap. XI. 1-15.

1 THEN [And][1] Nahash the Ammonite came up, and encamped against[2] Jabesh-
Gilead; and all the men of Jabesh said unto [to] Nahash, Make a covenant with
2 us, and we will serve thee. And Nahash the Ammonite answered [said to]
them, On this condition will I make a covenant[3] with you, that I may thrust[4] out
3 all your right eyes, and lay it for a reproach upon all Israel. And the elders of
Jabesh said unto [to] him, Give[5] us seven days respite, that we may send messen-
gers unto all the coasts[6] of Israel, and then [*om.* then] if there be no man to save
4 us, we will come out to thee. Then came the messengers [And the messengers
came] to Gibeah of Saul,[7] and told the tidings[8] in the ears of the people; and all
people lifted up their voices and wept.

5 And behold, Saul came after the herd [oxen] out of [from] the field. And Saul
said, What aileth the people that they weep? And they told him the tidings of
6 the men of Jabesh. And the Spirit of God came upon Saul when he heard those
7 [these] tidings, and his anger was kindled greatly. And he took a yoke of oxen,
and hewed them in pieces,[9] and sent them[10] throughout all the coasts of Israel by
the hand of messengers, saying, Whosoever cometh not forth after Saul and after
Samuel, so shall it be done unto [to] his oxen. And the fear of the Lord [Jehovah] fell on the people, and they came out with one consent [as one man].

8 And when [*om.* when] he numbered them in Bezek, [*ins.* and] the children of
9 Israel were three hundred thousand, and the men of Judah thirty thousand.[11] And
they said unto [to] the messengers that came, Thus shall ye say unto [to] the men

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. On reading of Sept. and Vulg. see Expos.—TR.]
[2] [Ver. 1. Or, laid siege to.—TR.]
[3] [Ver. 2. The word "covenant" is not in the Heb. but is involved in the verb. The insertion of the word in the Heb. text is therefore unnecessary. Throughout this passage the Sept. has explanatory additions, which need be regarded only as the freedoms of a translator.—TR.]
[4] [Ver. 2. Rendered "pick out" by Eng. A. V. in Ps. xxx. 17.—TR.]
[5] [Ver. 3. הֶרֶף Hiph. Impv. Apoc. of רָפָה. Ges. *Heb. Gr.*, § 75, Rem. 15.—TR.]
[6] [Ver. 3. Or, into every region.—TR.]
[7] [Ver. 4. Sept. has incorrectly "to Gibeah to Saul;" it is evident that the message was not brought to Saul. Syr. "the hill of Saul," Arab. "the city of Saul," but the word is a proper name.—TR.]
[8] [Ver. 4. Lit. "spake the words (or things)." In ver. 5 it is: "related the words (or things)."—TR.]
[9] [Ver. 7. Comp. Ex. xxix. 17; Lev. i. 6; Judg. xx. 6.—TR.]
[10] [Ver. 7. Some render: "sent (word) *etc.*, saying."—TR.]
[11] [Ver. 8. The Sept. gives for Israel 600,000, and for Judah 70,000, about double the numbers in the Heb. text—an illustration of the tendency to magnify numbers.—TR.]

of Jabesh Gilead, To-morrow, by that [the] time the sun be hot,[12] ye shall have help.
And the messengers came and showed [announced] it to the men of Jabesh; and
10 they were glad. Therefore [And] the men of Jabesh said, To-morrow we will
come out unto [to] you, and ye shall do with [to] us all that seemeth good unto
11 [to] you. And it was so [came to pass] on the morrow that Saul put the people in
three companies; and they came into the midst of the host in the morning-watch,
and slew the Ammonites until the heat of the day, and it came to pass that they
which remained were scattered, so that two of them were not left together.
12 And the people said unto [to] Samuel, Who is he that said, Shall Saul reign over
13 us?[13] bring[14] the men that we may put them to death. And Saul said, There shall
not a man be put to death this day; for to-day the Lord [Jehovah] hath wrought
14 salvation in Israel. Then said Samuel [and Samuel said] to the people, Come, and
15 let us go to Gilgal, and renew the kingdom there. And all the people went to Gil-
gal, and there they [*om.* they] made[15] Saul king before the Lord [Jehovah] in Gil-
gal, and there they [*om.* there they] sacrificed sacrifices of peace-offerings [*ins.*
there] before the Lord [Jehovah]; and there Saul[16] and all the men of Israel re-
joiced greatly.

[12] [Ver. 9. Lit. "in (Qeri, at) the heat of the sun;" see similar phrase in ver. 11.—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 12. Sept., Chald., Syr., Arab., insert a negative: "Saul shall not reign over us;" Chald., "is not fit to reign," Vulg. as Heb. This neg. does not necessarily imply a different text, yet a לֹא may easily have fallen out of the Heb., the preceding word ending with ל. The sense is the same in both readings.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 12. This word is plu. in Heb., Chald., Vulg., Arab., but sing. in Sept. and Syr.; the former, as the more difficult reading (since the address was to Samuel), is to be preferred.—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 15. Sept: anointed—as interpretation.—Tr.]

[16] [Ver. 15. Sept.: Samuel (instead of Saul)—more probably error of transcription than attempt to make Samuel conspicuous.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1–4. *The siege of Jabesh by Nahash, king of the Ammonites.*

Ver. 1. The need of a vigorous single leadership in war against the surrounding hostile peoples, especially in the first instance for the war threatened by the Ammonites (xii. 12), had occasioned the people's desire for a strong regal government like that of those nations. God had yielded to their desire, and through Samuel given them a king. But this king, after having been publicly presented and greeted as king, had withdrawn into seclusion. For a part of the people were unwilling to accept the new order of things under Saul's kingly authority, not believing that he could rescue the people from the threatening danger. It was, therefore, all-important that Saul should, by some deed of deliverance, show himself to be the king, who could lead Israel to victory over their enemies. Awaiting the moment when he could display his strength with the Lord's help as his Anointed, he had kept silence before the contempt of his enemies, and had retired to the quiet of his accustomed rural occupations. And not long after the day of Mizpah came the peril, in view of which the demand had been made for a king to lead the people to battle. *Nahash, the Ammonite, advanced with an army,* and began the war against Israel with the siege of Jabesh-Gilead. The Sept. inserts at the beginning of this verse from the preceding (x. 27) the words: "and it came to pass after a month,"* and is followed by Ew. and Then. though all other ancient translations agree with the mas. text, only the Vulg. adds to the translation of the text the words: *et factum est quasi post mensem*, an addition originating probably in the Itala, which follows the Sept. The statement of time is evidently an interpretation of the translation.* It is the less necessary for the connection by reason of the looseness of the chronology here. According to xii. 12 the threatened war with the Ammonites was the immediate occasion of the demand for a king. Naturally, therefore, Nahash, having before made his preparations, entered the Israelitish territory *soon* after the king was chosen and confirmed. If it had been intended to give this datum of time the word "*one*" must necessarily have been inserted.—On *Nahash*,† king of the Ammonites, see on 2 Sam. x. 2. We have here a renewal of the war with the Ammonites, which (according to Judg. x. 11) Israel had victoriously carried on under Jephthah. No doubt Nahash made the same charge against Israel—claiming the territory east of the Jordan which, it was alleged, Israel had taken from the Ammonites—which was then made by the king and repelled by Jeph. (Judg. xi. 13 sq.). Comp. Josh. xiii. 25. Jephthah's victory had not permanently broken the power of the Ammonites. Jabesh lay in northern Gilead, and belonged to the half-tribe of Manasseh. According to Joseph. (Ant. 6, 5, 1), it was the capital of Gilead; according to the Onom., "six Roman miles from Pella on the way to Gerasa," and is conjectured by Robinson (III. 319) and van der Velde (*Mem.*, p. 323) to be the same with the present ruins of Ed-Deir,‡ on the south side of the Wady *Jabis*, in which word is not improbably contained the name of the old Jabesh. Jabesh was the only city (Judg. xxi. 9) which did not take part in the war of

* [Reading כְּמוֹ חֹדֶשׁ instead of כְּמַחֲרִישׁ.—Tr.]

* [Not if he had a different text before him.—Tr.]

† [On the relation between this Nahash and the person mentioned in 2 Sam. xvii. 25 as father of Abigail, and for discussion of 1 Chr. ii. 16, see Arts. *Abigail*, *Zeruiah*, *Nahash*, in Smith's *Bib. Dict.* and the Commentaries *in loco*, and comp. 2 Sam. xvii. 27.—Tr.]

‡ ["On the mountains in full view of Beisan." Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 174.—Tr.]

extermination against Benjamin; its virgins were carried off for the Benjamites (Judg. xxi. 6 sq.). For the important connection of Jabesh with Saul's end see xxxi. 11–13 and 2 Sam. 4, 5.—The inhabitants of Jabesh are willing to come to an agreement with Nahash, and submit on reasonable conditions. This shows their entire defenceleasness against the enemy, and characterizes Israel's weakness in consequence of the lack of firm and permanent union among its parts. Instead of accepting their humble proposal, Nahash offers the Jabeshites the extremest insult by the threat that, unless they surrendered unconditionally,* he would put out the right eyes of all of them.† On cruel conduct towards conquered enemies see Rüetschi, *Herz. R. E.* VIII. 87 [also Arts. *War* in Dicts. of Smith and Fairbairn, and Saalschütz, *Archäologie der Hebräer*, II. 506.—Tr.]. Nahash will lay this as a reproach "*on all Israel*," not because they had not courage to help them (Bunsen), but with the intention of undertaking war against all Israel, and avenging the insult offered by Jephthah. Josephus' remark, that he threatened to do this "in order that, their left eyes being concealed by their shields, they might be wholly unserviceable," is correct only on this supposition, that he in fact designed to conquer first the city and then Gilead.—Ver. 3. Nahash grants the desired seven days, in which they are to send messengers into every part of Israel; in this time he thought to finish his preparations for the conquest of the city, in order, in the existing division of the Israelitish tribes and forces, the more surely to attain his end. The Jabeshites promised to yield themselves, *if no one came to their rescue*. The assumption of this as possible, and the fact that they sent to *every region* of Israel shows that in this transition-period from the Judges to the kingdom, in spite of what Samuel had done towards securing unity of action, the old division of powers in tribal isolation and the consequent weakness against enemies still continued. That the messengers (ver. 4) go nevertheless not separately to the various tribes, but all together first‡ to *Gibeah of Saul*, is doubtless according to instructions given them. And the reason could be only that this was the residence of the elected king, and the centre of the whole people. We are not to conclude (with Then.), from the fact of their going not to Saul, but to the people, that they knew nothing of his election as king; they presented their case before the people, and not Saul, because (as appears from what follows) he was not in Gibeah, and did not return from his ordinary occupation till after their statement was made.—The *weeping* of the people points to the greatness of the danger and the painful consciousness of helplessness. Perhaps Saul was held in least esteem in his native city.

Vers. 5–7. *Saul's first royal deed.* He gathers the people together, so that they rise as *one man* against the Ammonites, and the hitherto-existing disunion is at an end.—Ver. 5. When the messengers arrive, Saul is in the field engaged in agricultural labors. He is called from the *plough*, as Gideon from the *threshing-floor* (Judg. vi. 11 sq.), to do great deeds for his people. "*After the oxen*" refers to his walking behind the oxen, with which he had ploughed, and which are called in ver. 7 "a yoke of oxen."—Ver. 6. When he hears the cause of the people's lamenting and weeping, *the Spirit of God lays hold of him mightily*. The great moment had come when the fire of *mighty wrath*, inflamed by God's Spirit, kindled at the reproach inflicted by the enemy on his people, and he, in fulfillment of his royal calling to be the deliverer of his people, was to step forth according to the will of the Lord.—Ver. 7. *The cutting up of the oxen* alone would not have exhausted the meaning which (as appears from the context) this symbolical action was meant to have. There was necessary also the *sending of the pieces* into every region of Israel, that is, to every tribe, as in the similar procedure in Judg. xix. 29. The meaning of Saul's sharp words by the messengers: **Whosoever cometh not forth after Saul and after Samuel, so shall it be done to his oxen,** is only fully expressed by the *pieces* which are *sent along* with them. Though the "pieces" are not expressly mentioned in the text, as in Judg. xix. 29 (Then.), yet they must be understood from the connection. As there the pieces of the shamefully murdered woman's body, so here the pieces of the hewed oxen are the factual summons of the individual parts of the people to a common warfare, which was to avenge the wrong done them. Along with this similarity, however, between the two actions and their aims, there is an essential difference between them. In the former case the pieces represented the crime of the violated rights of hospitality and the expiation which was demanded. Here Saul sets forth the punishment to be expected by every one who should not join the campaign against the enemy; *he threatens* the exercise of his judicial power, which is a function of his royal office. The subject [*i. e.* executer] of the threat is neither the *people* of the recusant person (Josephus), nor the invading *enemy*, but it is *he*, the king of Israel, who is thoroughly conscious of his authority to summon the whole people to war against the enemy, under the impulse of the Spirit of God, which has come upon him. Saul here steps forth, in the name of the Lord, who has chosen him to save His people from their foes, with an act of sovereign theocratic royal power. As possessor of this power he names himself first as leader of Israel, and then Samuel *second*. That, however, he does *connect* the latter's name with his, shows Samuel's high position as prophet and watchman of the kingdom and (with the retention of his judicial authority) as leader of the people along with Saul, and proves also Samuel's approval of this assumption of royal authority before the people. His symbolical action and the accompanying threat, which is to rouse the people from division to unity, and from lethargy to a common enterprise, is thus stamped with the prophetic and judicial authority of Samuel, under which Saul's royal authority stands.—Clericus excellently re-

* [This is not the exact expression of the text; rather the putting out of the eyes was the condition of surrender and treaty offered in savage pleasantry by Nahash.—Tr.]

† בְּזוֹת, "in this," that is, on this condition. The suff. ָה in שְׂמְתִּיהָ is to be taken as neuter, referring to the putting out of the eyes.

‡ [It is not said, that they went *first* to Gibeah.—Tr.]

marks: "This was a symbolical action which, by the exhibition of the pieces of the oxen, struck the mind more than words alone would have done." The action belongs to the category of symbolical acts, which set forth corporally and vigorously the content of the following words, in order to strengthen their impression. See 1 Kings xi. 30; xxii. 11; 2 Kings xiii. 18. Comp. the symbolical actions in the prophetic writings. —The powerful impression made by Saul's appearance and act is indicated in a *two-fold* way: 1) *The fear of Jehovah fell on the people.* Clericus: "Either fear sent or in some peculiar way infused into men's minds by God, or fear lest they should offend God, if they refused to obey the command of the king and the prophet." The second explanation is to be preferred; for Saul's appearance is theocratic; he speaks in the name and under the commission of the Lord, whose instrument he, as well as Samuel, is. The people, impressed by his act and his words, recognize the holy and mighty will of their God, and are seized by a wholesome fear before the Lord, which leads them to recognize the obligation to fulfil his command revealed through Saul. "The fear of the Lord" is here, therefore, not a "panic fear" (Thenius, Böttcher); for Jehovah is not= Elohim, as Keil well remarks;* the reference is to the relation of the people to their covenant-God, who anew reveals Himself; 2) *And they came out as one man.* The effect of Saul's appearance and message to the whole people was that they rose out of division into a firm unity of parts (tribes) and powers. The Spirit of the Lord, which impelled Saul to this noble and vigorous action, so strangely contrasted with his former quiet life behind the plough, laid hold at the same time on the whole nation, so that it was suddenly lifted up, as it were involuntarily, in the uniting and strengthening power of this Spirit from above, to a new life before God (in His fear) and within itself (in unity and union) against the enemies of the theocracy.

Vers. 8-11. *Saul's deed of deliverance by victory over the Ammonites.* The summoning of the people and the gathering of the hosts goes swiftly on. The latter is presupposed in the phrase "numbered or *mustered* them." This took place in *Bezek*, in the Tribe of Issachar, in the plain of Jezreel, not far from Bethshean, at about as great an elevation as Jabesh, according to the Onom. 17† Roman miles north of Neapolis (Nablus), on the road to Scythopolis. This place must not be confounded with the Bezek in the Tribe of Judah, where the Canaanites and Perizzites under their king Adonibezek were beaten by Judah and Simeon, Judg. i. 3, 4. In respect to the separate mention of Israel and Judah [ver. 8] Clericus remarks: "this smacks of the times that followed the division of the Israelites into two kingdoms." See the same distinction made in xvii. 52; xviii. 16; 2 Sam. ii. 9 sq.; iii. 10; v. 1-5; xix. 41 sq.; 1 Sam. xx. 24. That the large and powerful tribe of Judah has the relatively small number (30,000) of warriors over against the 300,000 of Israel, is due to the fact that a large part of its territory was in the possession of the Philistines, as to whose further advance more care had to be taken, now that the north-eastern frontier of the country was threatened by the Ammonites. The large numbers are explained by the general levy of the people (a sort of militia).—Ver. 9. The messengers from Jabesh are now dismissed with the answer that help would be brought them the next day by the time the sun was hottest. So confident is Saul with his army in the power of the prophetic spirit, that the Lord will through them bring help. Bold assurance of faith which, in a great undertaking, anticipates its success as an accomplished fact. The messengers from Jabesh had the same confidence of faith. —Ver. 10. "To-morrow," that is, one day after the messengers had returned to Jabesh. This message of the Jabeshites to the Ammonites must, according to ver. 3, have led the latter to believe that they wished to treat of terms of surrender. It was a stratagem which made the Ammonites all the more confident.—Ver. 11. They are *overpowered* by surprise. The time of the "morning-watch" is from 3 to 6 o'clock in the morning, when the night is darkest. As Saul's army was not a disciplined one, but hastily gathered from the whole people, he could only hope to gain a complete and decisive victory by attacking the confident Ammonites in their camp from three sides during their soundest sleep. The army, divided into three parts, came "into the midst of the camp" from different directions. The victory was complete "by the heat of the day;" the enemy's army is utterly scattered. "Two were not left together."

Vers. 12-15. *Saul's renewed confirmation and general recognition as king.*—Ver. 12. This bold deed of deliverance, performed under the immediate impulse of the Spirit from above at the head of the nation, legitimizes Saul before all Israel as their God-appointed king. It is quite in keeping with the enthusiasm with which he had inspired the people that they wished to punish his contemptuous opposers (x. 27) with death as traitors. The words: "Saul should reign over us" are to be taken either as *exclamation* or as *question.*—Ver. 13. In respect to this demand Saul appears in a yet nobler light. His heart is full of *humble piety;* he gives the glory to God alone, saying, "To-day Jehovah hath wrought salvation in Israel." The victory over the foe is to him nothing but a saving *act of God Himself.* He regards himself as simply the instrument of God. This is the ground (כִּי, "for") of the rejection of the demand; none should die that day. It is the utterance of royal *generosity* towards his enemies, whose hearts it must have won. Thereby he gained *another victory:* 1) over himself—he restrains himself in the exercise of a right, 2) over the anger of those who demanded that justice be executed, 3) over his former opponents, who now clearly see that which, under the influence of haughty contempt, they had doubted, and 4) over the whole people, who must have been carried

* [The word Elohim or *El* (God) is apparently sometimes used in the Old Testament in a superlative sense —"very great or high," as in Ps. xxxvi. 7 (6), which is literally "mountains of El," Ps. lxviii. 16 (15), 1 Sam. xiv. 15, or with Prep. ל (to) as in Jon. iii. 3. But in the former cases the true meaning of the word "God" is always kept in the foreground, though the adjectival conception "great" naturally attaches to it.—Tr.]

† [The German has incorrectly 7. Bezek is differently located by different writers. See the dictionaries of Winer, Fairbairn, and Smith, *s. v.*—Tr.]

along by him on the path of noble moral conduct, and lifted above themselves to the height on which he stood. The enthusiastic recognition of Saul by the whole nation as divinely appointed king was factually (in contrast with x. 27) completed.—Vers. 14, 15. Then follows, under Samuel's direction, the formal and solemn *renewal of the kingdom*. Samuel orders an assembly of the people at *Gilgal* in the Jordan-valley; from the scene of victory the people, led by Saul and Samuel, go to that *holy* spot. The object of the gathering he declares to be the *renewal of the kingdom* with reference to the election of king at Mizpah, x. 17 sq. What the "renewal of the kingdom" means must be learned from the following words: **There they made Saul king before Israel.**—The word וַיַּמְלִכוּ ["made king"] cannot be rendered "they *anointed* him," because that is not its meaning, and because the act of anointing could have been performed, not by the people, but only by Samuel in the name of Jehovah. For the rest, if there had been a second anointing, it would, on account of its importance, have been expressly mentioned, as in David's case, 2 Sam. ii. 4; v. 3. The translation of the Sept.: "Samuel anointed Saul" is obviously an interpretation, they stumbling at the strange word of the original (וַיַּמְלִכוּ), which seemed to contradict x. 17 sq., and adopting, as the best expedient, the supposition of a second anointing (with reference to x. 1), having in mind the double anointing of David. All the other ancient translations follow the Masoretic text. Starting from the unfounded assumption that an anointing is here spoken of, Thenius wrongly argues that here is a sign of different authorship for chap. xi. and x. 1-16, since a double anointing is hardly supposable. It is in itself quite supposable, since it actually occurred in David's case, though then for a definite reason. But the text gives no support to this supposition. For the words "they made him king before Jehovah" mean nothing else than the solemn announcement and presentation of Saul before the nation as divinely appointed king in consequence of the divine legitimation given by his brilliant exploit against the Ammonites. [What is above said by Dr. Erdmann may serve also as answer to Wellhausen's critical remarks on this paragraph. He holds that chap. xi. attaches itself naturally to x. 16, since Saul in xi. 1-11 is not king, though he knows that he will be, and his whole procedure corresponds psychologically with exactness to the tone of mind naturally induced by the signs x. 9-12. But this is no less true according to the present arrangement of the text. There is historical motive for the double declaration as king, and there is no external evidence to show that x. 17-27 and xi. 12-14 are interpolations.—Tr.] The "*before the Lord*" (Clericus: "calling on God's name and offering sacrifices to Him") indicates the essential difference between this act and the proclamation and homage at Mizpah, marking the *religious act of installation* sealed with a solemn *offering* (before the Lord), by which Saul was formally and solemnly consecrated to his office by the invisible God-king with renewed homage and recognition of the *whole* nation, and another pledge to keep the divine law. It is Saul's solemn inauguration. The previous facts in the history of his call are the ascending steps to this acme—the solemn beginning of his royal rule.—"What had been done for Saul himself on the day of his anointing, and for the people at the election of king had now in Gilgal been publicly renewed and confirmed for the whole kingdom." Schlier, Saul, p. 22. The "peace-offerings" which were sacrificed "before the Lord" expressed joy and gratitude before the Lord, the peaceful, joyful relation between Him and His people. Along with this religious side of joy the connected *sacrificial meal* represented its human side. Thus was celebrated at Gilgal by king and people a festival of *great joy*. There Samuel performs the functions of *priest*, and, as *prophet* and priest, is and remains the organ of the word and blessing of God, under which king and people equally stand, and by which the two are to form the indissoluble theocratic unity and fellowship, which from now on must be the foundation of the whole theocratic life.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

See the Exegetical explanations. In addition the following remarks may be made:

1. The deeper the ignominy and the greater the need of God's people under the threats of the powerful foe, so much the more glorious was the deliverance, so much the more overwhelming the manifestation of the glory and the faithfulness of the covenant-God. The weeping of the people in view of the powerlessness of the ununited tribes and of the scornful pride of the enemy, expressed at the same time the humble, penitent spirit in which they sought the Lord's help, as, in the time of the Judges, after defection and alienation from God, they ever turned penitently to the Lord when their need was greatest.

2. Saul's call, in accordance with the occasion which led to the demand for the kingdom, and in accordance with the historical relations of the people to the surrounding heathen nations, was a *military* one. And so the prelude to his assumption of the government and his public solemn confirmation as king of Israel is this military deed, whose theocratic significance is indicated by the fact, that its source and origin is said to be the laying hold and filling of Saul by the power of the Spirit of God (ver. 6). For the military work of the theocratic king must be sanctified, guided, accomplished by God directly through His *Spirit*, in order that the outer and inner conditions of the farther development of the theocracy in Israel may be secured.

3. The "coming of the Spirit of God" on Saul (ver. 6), and on the organs of the theocracy generally, is not to be volatilized into an intensifying of their spiritual life, an uplifting of themselves to words and deeds in the service of God, but must be held to be a real, supernatural entrance of the Spirit of God into their inner life. This, however, is accomplished here (vers. 5, 6) as in x. 10, not without an external, natural occasion and human instrumentality. The Spirit of God advances along the path marked out by the divine wisdom.

4. There is a holy *anger*, justified before God, like that which seized Saul (ver. 6). Its origin is the Spirit from above, whose flame kindles it; its

object is the power of sin, the shame and ignominy inflicted on God's people and name, the enemies of God; its aim is the honor of God and the furtherance of the ends of His kingdom.

5. *The power of the Spirit of God*, which filled and impelled Saul showed itself, in its comprehensive, penetrating power over the national life, by the twofold effect, which was decisive for the first joint action of king and people, and also full of typical meaning for their whole history as people of God: *the fear of the Lord* in the relation of the people to their God, and *the unity* of their different parts ("the people went out as one man"); the innermost, the fear of Jehovah, was the source of their conjunction to a firm unity. To awaken and nourish the *fear of God* in the people by energetic, divinely-guided government, and to set the people *as one man* in their theocratic fellowship over against the heathen peoples as the people of the Lord, was the task and calling of the theocratic monarchy. These two aims contain the roots of the *love of God and one's neighbor* as the twofold *fundamental law of the kingdom of God*. Matt. xxii. 37–40; Deut. vi. 5 sq.; Lev. xix. 18.

6. When Saul, at his election as king and the partial homage which he received, maintained silence towards his scornful enemies and practiced self-denial in quietness and patience, he performed (over against the demand to visit deserved punishment on the despisers of the Lord's Anointed) under the guidance of God's Spirit an act of *love to enemies*, letting them go unpunished, and setting aside the demand to visit strict justice on them by pointing to the grace and salvation wherein God had just revealed Himself to the whole nation. A prelude of the *disposition* of forbearing, merciful love, which finds its *fulfilment* in the New Testament according to the *word* of the Lord (Matt. v. 44), and through the *Spirit* from above (Luke ix. 55), and has its ground in *personal experience* of the merciful love of God (Luke vi. 36).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 1–11. *On what depends the help and deliverance of a people in times of great distress?* 1) They must lift their voices imploringly to God (ver. 4). 2) The men whom God has raised up as their helpers, they must receive with confidence as the Lord's instruments (vers. 5-7). 3) They must be subject in obedience and fidelity to the rulers given them by God. 4) They must place themselves under the discipline and guidance of God's Spirit, in order, *a*) in true fear of God to be well-pleasing to the Lord, and *b*) in true unity of love to be as one man.

Vers. 1–5. *What is meant by the question in a king's mouth: What aileth the people that they weep?* 1) A father's faithful *observation* of his people's weal and woe. 2) A brother's sympathizing *compassion* for their distress. 3) A king's magnanimous *readiness* to help.

[Vers. 5-11. HENRY (altered): The spirit and conduct of Saul (comp. x. 9): 1) His humility—anointed king, but following the oxen. 2) His concern for his neighbors (ver. 5). 3) His zeal for the safety and honor of Israel (ver. 6). 4) The authority and power he exerted, upon this important occasion. 5) His faith and confidence (ver. 9). 6) His industry and close application to this business (vers. 8, 11). 7) His success.—TR.]

Vers. 6–11. *The holy communion in which king and people should stand, through the Spirit of the Lord:* 1) In righteous *anger* against all that is hostile to God's kingdom (ver. 6); 2) In true *fear of God*, which unites king and people *inwardly* before the Lord; 3) In faithful *love*, wherein *a*) the people are heartily obedient to the king's will, which aims at the common welfare, and *b*) under his guidance they rise up as *one man* against the common enemy, and to help the suffering fellow-citizens (ver. 7); 4) In firm, confident faith in the Lord's support, which does not suffer his people to be put to shame (vers. 8-11).

Vers. 8, 9. *The messages, To-morrow ye shall have help:* 1) A *testimony* of *helpful, active* brotherly love; 2) A *promise* of *prompt, hastening* help; 3) A trustworthy *assurance* of fortunate *success;* 4) A *source* of great *joy* ("rejoiced greatly").

Vers. 12–15. *To-day the Lord hath wrought salvation in Israel:* 1) A *jubilee-cry*, praising the Lord's honor; 2) A *warning cry*, reminding of guilty offences against forgiving and compassionate love; 3) An *awakening cry*, demanding the presentation of *thank-offerings* before the Lord; 4) A *joyous cry*, calling to be glad in the Lord.

J. DISSELHOFF: *The first kingly deed.* The two noblest ornaments of a servant of God are united in it: 1) Burning, holy zeal in the cause of God and the brethren; 2) Corresponding gentleness in one's own cause.

[Vers. 4–6. SCOTT: The Lord, in providence, will make way for those whom He has designed and prepared for usefulness; nor shall any repent of humbly waiting in obscurity and honest industry, till He is pleased to call them forth; for pride and impatience alone can conclude, that the only wise God has lighted a candle to leave it under a bushel.—TR.]

Ver. 6. STARKE: Official wrath is unforbidden. [Compare "Historical and Theological," No. 4. Anger is sometimes lawful, sometimes a duty. It is difficult, but not impossible, to "be angry and sin not" (Eph. iv. 26). Our Lord was at the same time angry and grieved (Mark iii. 5).—TR.] S. SCHMID: It is the Spirit of God alone that works good in men, whether in an ordinary or an extraordinary manner. DISSELHOFF: Without this zeal no anointed one may be found. For this word will always hold good: "Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord slothfully" [so Luther in Jer. xlviii. 10. Eng. A. V., "deceitfully," but margin, "negligently," which better suits the connection.—TR.]—But in truth zeal alone is not yet the right ornament of the warriors of Christ. Prove thy zeal, whether it is not perhaps mixed with flesh and blood, or even proceeds altogether from this fountain; and know that zeal for the Lord's cause should not flow from mere excitability, from a momentary ebullition of natural compassion, or from being overcome by human displeasure and anger. Not the strange fire which the sons of Aaron took, but the fire from the holy altar, the Spirit of God—let us learn it from Saul!—must overmaster, inflame, inspire us.

Ver. 7. *Berl. Bible:* There are two sorts of fear. One is a selfish, reward-seeking fear. In

this we are caring for ourselves, and it is self-interest that excites, and that is properly human fear. But there is also a fear of the Lord, the fear that one has for His sake alone, when one fears lest the Lord has been grieved through our own sins, or those of others, or lest we or others should not have sufficiently glorified Him in ourselves.—DISSELHOFF: This can *one* man accomplish in the people of God, when he is driven by a holy, fiery zeal. The fear of God goes forth from him, and falls upon all to whom he comes. As soon as the fear of the Lord drives an army, a people, to the conflict, no need of being uneasy as to the result.—*One* cowardly, surly soldier of Christ, afraid of suffering, easily makes a hundred cowards, for cowardice is contagious.—Ver. 12. STARKE: As in God, so in His deputies, mercy and justice should be inseparable; wheresoever these two go asunder, government follows them into distraction, and ends in ruin.*—DISSELHOFF: Such a saying (ver. 13) is the fairest ornament of God's warriors, lion-like zeal against the enemies of God, against sin and all its outbreaks, a lamb-like disposition towards individual sinners, for they are not to be destroyed, but to be saved through the same salvation that has fallen to our lot.—BERLENB. BIBLE: Saul's answer instructs the people in two things at once: first, that we must not ascribe victory to *man*, but to *God;* secondly, that we must not be too swift in judging those who through ignorance have rejected God's guidance, and that the salvation which God has, in so glorious a manner, given to Israel, would be mighty enough to bring back again those who have wandered away.—God wills not the death of the sinner, *etc.* Excessive strictness rather repels sinners, than brings them right again.—Vers. 14, 15. CRAMER: The best bond between authorities and subjects is that they intend to be mutually faithful.—DISSELHOFF: When one does even something great for his Lord, and does not shrink from much toil and trouble for His sake, can his heart abide in very great joy if he forgets gentleness and patience towards his neighbor, becomes provoked against him, bitter and ill-mannerly?

* [As Starke has borrowed this (apparently without acknowledgment) word for word from the English Bishop Hall, we have not re-translated, but given the original. And so in numerous subsequent cases.—TR.]

II. *Samuel's solemn concluding Transaction with the Assembly of the People at Gilgal.*

CHAPTER XII. 1–25.

1 AND Samuel said unto all Israel, Behold I have hearkened unto your voice in
2 all that ye said unto me, and have made a king over you. And now, behold, the
king walketh before you, and I am old and gray-headed,[1] and behold, my sons
[my sons, behold, they] are with you, and I have walked before you from my
3 childhood unto this day. Behold, here I am. Witness against me before the
Lord [Jehovah] and before his Anointed: whose ox have I taken? or, whose ass
have I taken? or, whom have I defrauded? whom have I oppressed? or, of whose
hand have I received *any* [a] bribe to blind mine eyes therewith?[2] and I will
4 restore it you. And they said, Thou hast not defrauded us, nor oppressed us, nei-
5 ther hast thou taken aught of any man's hand. And he said unto them, The Lord
is [Jehovah be] witness against you, and his Anointed is [be] witness this day, that
ye have not found aught in my hand. And they[3] answered [said], He is witness
6 [Witness be they]. And Samuel said unto the people, *It is* [*om.* it is] the Lord
[Jehovah][4] that [who] advanced [appointed] Moses and Aaron, and that [who]
brought your fathers up out of the land of Egypt!
7 Now, therefore, [And now] stand still [stand forth] that I may [and I will]
reason with you before the Lord [Jehovah][5] of all the righteous acts of the Lord
8 [Jehovah] which he did to you and to your fathers. When Jacob was come

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 2. Sept. wrongly καθήσομαι, as if from יָשַׁב.—TR.]
[2] [Ver. 3. Or, "in his account;" so Chald.: "I hid my eyes in judgment from him." Sept. reads: "a ransom (proper rendering of כֹּפֶר, but here—"bribe") and a sandal (reading נַעֲלַיִם, instead of אֶעְלִים), answer against me, and," *etc.* So in Sir. xlvi. 19. Vulg.: "I will despise that to-day." Syr. and Chald. support Heb. The insertion in the Sept. of the easy "answer" is suspicious, and the "sandal" is hard. It seems better to retain the abbreviated Heb. text.—TR.]
[3] [Ver. 5. Heb. is sing., but Sept. and several VSS. and Heb. MSS. plu.; the subject is "the people," which may have been taken as a sing. collective.—TR.]
[4] [Ver. 6. Sept.: "Jehovah be witness, who," *etc.*, a natural and suspicious insertion, and not necessary. Syr. has "Jehovah is God alone." Ch. and Vulg. as Heb.—TR.]
[5] [Ver. 7. Sept. inserts: "and I will tell you," which makes the sentence easier, but is easily supplied in the pregnant Heb. construction.—TR.]

[came] into Egypt, and[6] your fathers cried unto the Lord [Jehovah], then the
Lord [Jehovah] sent Moses and Aaron, which [and they] brought forth [*om.* forth]
9 your fathers out of Egypt and made them dwell in this place. And when [*om.*
when] they forgat the Lord [Jehovah] their God, [*ins.* and] he sold them into the
hand of Sisera, captain of the host of Hazor,[7] and into the hand of the Philistines,
10 and into the hand of the king of Moab, and they fought against them. And they
cried unto the Lord [Jehovah] and said, We have sinned, because we have forsaken
the Lord [Jehovah], and have served Baalim and Ashtaroth; but [and] now
11 deliver us out of the hand of our enemies, and we will serve thee. And the Lord
[Jehovah] sent Jerubbaal, and Bedan,[8] and Jephthah, and Samuel,[8] and delivered
12 you out of the hand of your enemies on every side, and ye dwelled safe. And
when ye saw that Nahash the king of the children of Ammon came against you,
ye said unto me, Nay, but a king shall reign over us, when the Lord [Jehovah]
your God was your king.
13 Now, therefore, [And now] behold the king whom ye have chosen, *and* [*om. and*]
whom ye have desired [demanded];[9] and behold, the Lord [Jehovah] hath set a
14 king over you. If ye will fear the Lord [Jehovah], and serve him, and obey his
voice, and not rebel against the commandment of the Lord [Jehovah], then shall
[*om.* then shall, *ins.* and] both ye and also [*om.* also] the king that reigneth over
you [*ins.* will] continue following [follow] the Lord [Jehovah] your God, *well.*[10]
15 But if ye will not obey the voice of the Lord [Jehovah], but rebel against the
commandment of the Lord [Jehovah], then shall the hand of the Lord [Jehovah]
16 be against you, as it was against your fathers.[11] Now, therefore, [And now] stand
17 and see this great thing, which the Lord [Jehovah] will do before your eyes. Is
it not wheat harvest to-day? I will call unto the Lord [Jehovah], and he shall
[will] send thunder and rain; that ye may perceive [know] and see that your
wickedness is great which ye have done in the sight [eyes] of the Lord [Jehovah]
18 in asking you a king. So [And] Samuel called unto the Lord [Jehovah], and the
Lord [Jehovah] sent thunder and rain that day; and all the people greatly feared
the Lord [Jehovah] and Samuel.
19 And all the people said unto Samuel, Pray for thy servants unto the Lord
[Jehovah] thy God that we die not; for we have added unto all our sins *this* evil,
20 to ask us a king. And Samuel said unto the people, Fear not. Ye have done all
this wickedness; yet turn not aside from following the Lord [Jehovah], but serve
21 the Lord [Jehovah] with all your heart; And turn ye not aside, for[12] *then should
ye go* [*om.* for then should ye go] after vain things, which cannot [do not] profit nor
22 deliver, for they are vain. For the Lord [Jehovah] will not forsake his people
for his great name's sake; because it hath pleased the Lord [Jehovah] to make
23 you his people. Moreover [*om.* moreover] as for me [*ins.* also], God forbid that I
should [*om.* God forbid that I should, *ins.* far be it from me to] sin against the
Lord [Jehovah] in ceasing to pray for you,[13] but I will teach you the good and
24 the [*om.* the] right way.[14] Only fear the Lord [Jehovah] and serve him in truth
with all your heart; for consider [see] how great *things* [how greatly] he hath
25 done [wrought] for you [towards you]. But if ye shall still [*om.* still] do wickedly,
ye shall be consumed [destroyed] both ye and your king.

[6] [Ver. 8. Erdmann not so well makes the apodosis begin here. Here Sept. inserts: "and Egypt humbled them," which has much to recommend it. But, if it had been in the original text, it would be hard to explain how it fell out. The addition of "and his sons" after "Jacob" in the Sept. is probably spurious.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 9. Sept.: "host of Jabis king of Asor," which agrees with the expression in Judg. iv. 2, 7. So the Vulg.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 11. Sept.: Barak. In the Syr. the list is: Deborah, Barak, Gideon, Nephtah, Samson. Probably we should read "Barak" for "Bedan;" the others as in the Heb. text. See Exegetical Notes.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 13. Omitted in Sept. The order in the Heb. does not seem natural, but may refer to the two paths by which they obtained the king (chs. x. and xi.). Wellhausen suggests that there is here a duplet. De Rossi prefers, on the authority of many MSS. and three VSS. (Syr., Vulg., Arab.), the insertion of "and" before "whom ye have demanded."—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 14. On the construction see Exeget. Notes. For Heb. והייתם, "be," Chald. in Walton's Polyg. has תחיון, "live" (which does not help the matter), but P. de Lagarde's ed. of Codex Reuchlinianus (Targ.) has תתנהון, "be gathered."—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 15. Sept.: "and against your king," which accords with ver. 14.—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 21. The כִּי is, with all the ancient vss., to be omitted. Syr. and Arab. and Chald. diverge slightly from the masor. text.—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 23. Sept. inserts: "and I will serve the Lord."—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 23. The omission of the Art. in ב is strange.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **And Samuel said to all Israel.** That *the following words were really spoken by Samuel* is put beyond doubt by the direct impression of historical truth which this narrative in chap. xii. makes, and by the homogeneity of the individual historical features of this picture with the historical picture given us in all that precedes. Ewald (*Gesch.* [*History of Israel*] I., 229, Rem. 2) calls this a narrative "which in its present form is inserted only for the sake of the exhortations to be put into Samuel's mouth, and the occasional historical statements of which sound very discrepant," against which we remark: 1) that the historical statements in this piece, as the exposition will show, do not at all contradict the foregoing historical account, and 2) that if a mere insertion had been intended here, in order to put exhortations into Samuel's mouth, it would have been simpler to give it in the form of a monologue; that is, a continuous address of Samuel to the people.—We have here, namely, not *one* continuous *address* of Samuel, as this section is usually called, but a *dialogue*, a conversation or transaction with the people in the grandest style. Samuel speaks to all Israel, and they speak to him by the mouth of their elders (cf. vers. 3-6, 19, 20), and the longer connected declarations of the prophet (vers. 7-17 and 20-26) are embraced by these colloquies and attached to them.—Incorrect also is the usual designation of this section as a *parting-address*, whereby its significance in relation to the preceding account of Saul's public solemn presentation to the whole people as king of Israel is obscured or concealed. Samuel does not take leave of the people in order to withdraw from the scene of public life and action into the retirement of private life; he rather promises the continuance not only of his intercession for them, but also of his prophetic labors in respect to the whole people; he points expressly to the elevated position which he will assume, as "teacher of the good and right way," hereafter, as now, towards king and people.—Further, when the whole procedure, as is common, is regarded as a *solemn resignation of office* by Samuel, we must call attention to the fact mentioned in vii. 15, that he "judged Israel all the days of his life," and to the vigorous interference which he repeatedly found necessary during Saul's government. Certainly with the incoming of the kingdom, which the people desired instead of the existing judgeship (viii. 5, 20) in order that the king might judge the people and lead them in war, the official position which Samuel had hitherto occupied as judge in Israel, must have had an end; and this end of his proper judicial office, sole and highest Governor of Israel as he had hitherto been, is the *starting-point* for what he has now still to say to the people. He remains *in fact* what he was, the highest judge of Israel according to the will of God, under whose oversight and guidance the kingdom also stands; *officially* the leadership for external and internal political affairs, for which the kingdom was established, is no longer in his hands. Of a resignation of office nothing is said, but (proceeding only from the *fact* that the government is now given into the hands of the king, and his official government as judge has now consequently come to an end) he *passes in review his previous official life as judge of the people*, in order, over against the fulfilment of their desire for a king, which was a factual rejection of his official judgeship externally occasioned by the evil conduct of his sons (viii. 1-7), solemnly to testify and cause them to testify that he had filled his office blamelessly and righteously. On this follows (vers. 7-12) the rebuking *reference to the great deeds of the Lord*, wherein in the history of His guidance of the people He had magnified Himself in them, and to *the guilty relation of ingratitude and unfaithfulness* in which they had placed themselves to this their God and king by the longing after an earthly king, which was a rejection of His authority over them. In vers. 13-18, after a solemn confirmation of the *fact*, that God the Lord in accordance with that desire had given them a king, in powerful words, which are accompanied and strengthened by an astounding miracle, he *exhorts king and people together to the right relation*, in which *in faithful obedience* they are to put themselves, *to the will and word of the Lord*. King and people are to be obedient subjects of the invisible king. Finally follows (vers. 19-25) a *word of consolation from Samuel* to the people now, in consequence of this warning and hortatory address, repentantly confessing their sin in their demand for a king, in which he gently and in friendly fashion exhorts them to obedience and faithfulness towards the Lord (vers. 20, 21), promises them the Lord's grace and faithfulness (ver. 22), and assures them of his continuing active fellowship with them in intercession and in instruction in the way of truth (ver. 23), and finally with repeated exhortation and warning sets before them the blessing and good pleasure of the Lord along with a threatening reference to the punishment to be expected in case of disobedience (vers. 24, 25).—With this fourfold division this whole dialogic transaction of Samuel with the people connects itself immediately with what precedes, as the conclusion of the assembly of the people in Gilgal. On this connection see Thenius' remarks. *Berlenberger Bible*: "*Thus with this ends in solemn wise the general assembly of the people.*" [Philippson (in *Israel. Bib.*): "This chapter is one of the finest in the book, and is a model of old-Hebrew eloquence. Words and tone speak for the high antiquity of this piece."—Tr.]

The words: **See, I have hearkened to your voice in all that ye said to me** correspond exactly to the words in viii. 7, 21. Samuel at the same time testifies indirectly to the fact that *he* had therein obeyed the command of God: "Hearken to the voice of the people" (viii. 7, 9, 22). His listening to the voice of the people was based on the repeated divine command, and was an act of self-denying obedience to the will of the Lord.—"And I have made a king" points to ver. 15 *a* of the preceding chapter.—Ver. 2. **Walketh** is to be understood not merely of leading in war, but in general of the official guidance and government of the people. The "and I" introduces the contrast between the Hitherto and the Now. **I am grown old and gray-headed** points to the words of the elders, viii. 5. As the people by the mouth of their elders there take occasion from his *age* to ask a king for themselves, so Samuel here refers back to it, in order not only to point out

that this their demand was fulfilled, since he in fact by reason of his age could no longer hold in his hands the internal and external control of the people, but at the same time, in view of the termination of his office and the beginning of the royal rule, to give account of the righteous character of his long career. The reference to his sons as occupying official positions is not to be regarded (Thenius, Keil, *et al.*) as a confirmation of his age, but looking to chap. viii. 1 (where it is expressly said that Samuel *on account of his age* had made his sons judges over Israel, that is, his assistants in the judicial office) rather as a confirmation of the declaration that this change in the government must needs have taken place by reason of his age, which had already necessitated the substitution of his sons. [It is clearly wrong to suggest (*Bib. Com. in loco*) that "a tinge of mortified feeling at the rejection of himself and his family, mixed with a desire to recommend his sons to the favor and good-will of the nation, is at the bottom of this mention of them." There is no trace here of mortification or favor-seeking. Samuel stands throughout above the people, and promises his continued friendship and watch-care, while he cordially accepts the change of the government.—Tr.]. What Samuel here affirms of his official career stands in direct contrast with what is said in chap. viii. 3 of the blameworthy official conduct of these sons, since it is inconceivable that he did not know, and now have in mind the covetousness and perversion of judgment and the resulting discontent of the people, which was a cofactor in their desire for a royal government. The mode as well as the fact and content of the following self-justification naturally suggest the statement in viii. 3, and lead to the conclusion that this was the occasion of this (otherwise surprising) justification of his official career, on which in the eyes of the people a shadow had fallen in consequence of the opposite conduct of his sons. In order that, at this important turning-point of his life and of his people's history, there may be perfect clearness and truth in respect to his judicial career and his *unselfish official bearing towards the people*, and that the lightest shadow of mistrust and misunderstanding may be dispelled, he in the first place refers to *his official life which lay clear and open before the eyes of the people from his youth unto this moment* when he had become old and gray; for the words "I have walked before you," like the preceding "walketh," indicate his public official intercourse and walk.—Ver. 3. **Answer against me**, that is, witness against me. A formal hearing of witnesses as a judicial act is here introduced. The judicial *authorities* are two, a heavenly, invisible, *God the Lord*, the All-knowing, before whom he walked, and an earthly-human, clothed, however, with divine authority, the *Anointed of the Lord*, who in the name and place of God executes the royal office, which includes the judicial. Here for the first time after the establishment of the kingdom the theocratic king is called the *Anointed of the Lord*. Here for the first time after his installation regard is had to Saul in his royal authority and position. Before him as before the Lord, the people, in reply to Samuel's questions put in powerful lapidary style and with grand rhetoric, must bear witness to the following: 1) *That he had not covetously appropriated the property of others*,—"ox and ass" represent property in a social life based on agriculture and trade, and are expressly named in the Law with the things forbidden to covet (Ex. xx. 17); Samuel's sons, on the contrary, "turned after gain," that is, were covetous, viii. 5;—2) *that he had violated no man's right and freedom by oppression and violence*,—רָצַץ "defraud" is stronger than עָשַׁק "oppress;" both often occur together, as in Deut. xxviii. 33, to express violence;—his sons "*perverted judgment*," viii. 3;—3) *that he had not been guilty of venality in the administration of justice by receiving bribes*,—*kopher* (כֹּפֶר) "bribe" is here not to be regarded (with Keil) as simply a payment for release from capital punishment (Ex. xxi. 30; Num. xxxv. 31), but means in general a gift of money designed to buy the favor of the judge and thus escape deserved punishment. The gift was to *cover* the punishment [the Heb. word means primarily "cover,"—Tr.], and thus as covering be an *expiation*: "*that I might hide my eyes from him* (or, *with it*)."* The sons of Samuel took gifts, chap. viii. 3. This was a transgression of the Law, Ex. xxiii. 6; Deut. xxvii. 5.—The answer of the people: that Samuel had done no wrong.—Ver. 5. Strengthening of this declaration by the participation of the people in Samuel's invocation of the Lord and his Anointed as *witness*.† Calvin: "In these words they confess their ingratitude and perfidy before Jehovah and the king, in that they had rejected the so praiseworthy government of Samuel."

Ver. 6. Further strengthening of the testimony by repetition on Samuel's part of the invocation of God's witness. To "Jehovah" we must supply "*witness*;" there is no need to suppose that it fell out by clerical error.—Maurer: "Nothing has fallen out. Samuel repeats the name of Jehovah in order to *make the transition* to what follows." "Appointed" [עשׂה "made," Eng. A.V. "advanced"] refers to what they were in their God-appointed calling; they were just that for which the Lord had made them, as leaders of the people and their representatives before God.—Calvin: "The word 'make' is to be understood of those excellent gifts which God had bestowed

---

* Thenius, on the ground that הֶעְלִים in the sense of "hide" is always construed with מִן, changes the text וְאַעְלִים עֵינַי בּוֹ into וְנַעֲלַיִם עֲנוּ בִי, "and (if it were only) a pair of shoes; witness against me," against which Keil rightly remarks that the supposed meaning "hide from" does not suit here; that the thought is not that the judge hides his eyes from the כֹּפֶר in order not to see the bribe, but that he covers his eyes with the bribe, in order not to see and punish the crime. The בּוֹ, however, might also be referred to מִי, and would then mean: that I might hide my eyes "on his account," "towards him," or "in respect to him." The change after the Sept., requiring a large addendum for explanation, compels us to introduce a too special thing (shoes) in the most extraordinary way.

† We must read the Sing. וַיֹּאמֶר ["said"], not the Plu. (Qeri), since "the people" is to be taken as subject.

on Moses and his brother Aaron, that he might use their ministry in leading the people out of Egypt." Samuel also was made by the Lord into that which he was to be and was to the people. In taking part, now, in his invocation of God as witness to his impartiality and justice, the people gave confirmation that he had exercised his judicial authority before the Lord according to his divine calling, and that in this view therefore, there was no necessity for their demand for a king.

After (vers. 1-6) having solemnly testified and before God and the king made them testify to *the purity and spotlessness of his long official life among the people*, he joins (vers. 7-12) to the name of Jehovah, whom he has invoked as witness, *the humbling reminder of the unfaithfulness of which they had been guilty in respect to this their God and Lord and His benefits by the demand for an earthly-human king.* He here looks at *the relation of the people to their God.* The reference to Moses and Aaron as the first instruments of the Lord's mighty deeds for His people, and His first deed, the deliverance from Egypt, forms the transition to the following *enumeration* of God's might-revelations for the deliverance of His people from great dangers.

Ver. 7. Formally and solemnly the first words "and now stand forth that I may reason with you before the Lord" introduce as it were a judicial procedure (Cleric.: "I will conduct my cause, as it were, before a judge"), in which Samuel as the judge before the tribunal of the invisible king represents God's cause over against the people, and holds up before the latter their guilt in this matter of the king.* Ezek. xvii. 20. צְדָקָה [righteous deeds] never means merely "blessing, benefit, kindness," but always contains the idea of righteousness. It indeed often actually means all that (as in Psalm xxii. 32; xxiv. 5; Judg. v. 11; Prov. x. 2; xi. 4) but always from the stand-point of God's faithfulness in covenant and promise; the acts of salvation are proof of the divine righteousness, so far as they are God's reply to man's right conduct towards Him, or, without this, an outflow of God's faithfulness by which He grants man the thing promised as something falling to his share. The Plu. "*righteous acts*," as in Mic. vi. 5, are God's several deeds of power and grace performed for His people on the ground of His covenant-relation instituted in Abraham and through Moses. [*Bib. Comm.:* Samuel is here vindicating God, comp. Stephen's speech, Acts vii.].—Ver. 8. The first and greatest of the mighty deeds of the divine covenant-righteousness is the *deliverance out of Egypt and introduction into the land of promise.*† In ver. 9 the: **and they forgat the Lord their God** is put as contrast to the "righteous acts" of the Lord; they answered God's covenant-fidelity with unfaithfulness, defection. And so the oppressions of the people by foreign enemies are represented as *punishments* by the righteous God for their defection. **He sold them into the hand,** *etc.*, indicates the just retribution of their *forgetting Him.* When His people abandon Him, He, by virtue of the same righteousness which blesses them if they are faithful, abandons them to their enemies, who enslave and oppress them. The "selling" refers to the right of the father to sell his children as slaves, here exercised by God as the extremest paternal right, as it were (Judg. ii. 14; iii. 8; iv. 2, 9; Deut. xxxii. 10; Isa. l. 1; lii. 3; Ezek. xxx. 12). [It is also the right of the king to sell his subjects, and of God to dispose of His creatures.—Tr.].—In proof of this punitive justice of God Samuel adduces individual facts from the time of the Judges on, but only "prominent events, as they occurred to him . . . neglecting the order of events and of times, which was here unessential" (Cleric.). [*Poole's Synopsis:* Notice here Samuel's prudence in reproof: 1) by his reproof of their ancestors he prepares their minds to receive reproof; 2) he shows that their ingratitude is old and so worse, and they should take care that it grow no stronger; 3) he chooses a very mild word, "forget," to express their offence.—Tr.].—*Hazor* was the capital city of the Canaanites, where dwelt king Jabin whom Joshua smote, Josh. xi. 1, 10-13; xii. 19. In the time of the Judges Hazor again appears as the residence of a Canaanitish king Jabin (Judg. iv. 2 sq.), instead of whom, however, the there-mentioned captain *Sisera* is here named, because he commanded the army which then oppressed Israel. The Sept. insertion of "Jabin king of" after "host of," is evidently a mere explanation.—**Into the hand of the Philistines**, see Judg. iii. 31, where the attacks of this people are first mentioned. [See also Judg. xiii. 1.—Tr.].—**Into the hand of the king of Moab**, that is, *Eglon* (Judg. iii. 12).—These three nations represent, as the most prominent, all the heathen nations into whose hands God gave His people. Samuel mentions them, looking to the *beginnings* of the sufferings and wars of the Period of the Judges, in respect to which in the Book of Judges also (ch. iii.) the "he *sold* them into the hands of their enemies round about" (ver. 14) and "*they forgat the Lord*" are introduced (as here by Samuel) as correlatives. —Ver. 10. The *repentant conversion* of the people. **And they cried to the Lord** (comp. Judg. ii. 18; iii. 9, 15; iv. 3), that is, the *lamentation* over their misery directed to the Lord. The following: **we have sinned** is their *self-accusation* on account of their defection from God; the sin is twofold, *forsaking the Lord and serving idols.* The same accusation is found literally in Judg. x. 40, only that here, as in Judg. ii. 13 and x. 6, Ashtaroth is added to Baalim. *Baal* is the general designation of the divinity among the Phenicians and Carthaginians; with the *Art.* it is the male chief deity of the Phenicians; the Plu. refers to the numerous individualizations of this deity. P. Cassel [in Lange's *Biblework*] on Judg. ii. 13: "The various cities and tribes had their special Baals, which were named not always from the cities, but from various natural qualities worshipped in them. This is like the various attributes from which Zeus received various names and worships in Greece." On Baal-cultus among the Is-

* The Accus. sign [אֵת) is here: "*concerning*," "*in respect to.*"—The verb *judge* usually has עַל with the object, as in Jer. ii. 35; Joel iii. 27; but has also the Accus. as in Ezek. xvii. 20.

† We are not with the Sept. to insert וּבָנָיו after יַעֲקֹב and וַתַּכְנִיעֵם after מִצְרַיִם. If either had originally been there, it would not have been omitted. The breviloquent text speaks for its originality. The וַיִּשְׁלַח is the explanation of the עָשָׂה in ver. 6).

raelites see Winer, *B. R.-W.* s. v. I., 118. *Ashtaroth* is the designation of the Phenician and Carthaginian female chief deity (along with Baal) which was also worshipped by the Philistines (1 Sam. xxxi. 10); the Plu. refers to the number of the stars, which she as queen of heaven represents (Jer. vii. 18; xliv. 17 sq.); for the Sing. Ashtoreth=Astarte (Grk.) has the same root as *star* [Germ. *stern*], ἀστήρ, *stella*, in Pers. Astara (on the Upper Asiatic origin of this word see J. G. Müller *s. v.* in Herzog's *R.-E.*); she was not merely the *moon goddess* alongside of Baal as sun-god, as her pictures with the moon-crescents on the head testify, but as light-giving night-goddess, also *star-goddess*, representative of the glittering host of heaven (Jer. vii. 18), like the later Artemis.* Comp. P. Cassel on Judg. ii. 13; Winer, *s. v.* On the renewed introduction of her worship by Solomon, in which is presented the fulfilment of Deut. iv. 19, see 1 Ki. xi. 5, 33.—On the accusation follows the *prayer*, "*Deliver us*" in contrast with the *forsaking* and *forgetting*, and the *vow* "*we will serve thee*" in contrast with "*we have served*" Baalim, *etc.* This *repentance* the Lord *graciously answers* (ver. 11): 1) by sending *deliverers*. Again only *a few* are mentioned: *Jerubbaal*-Gideon; the name signifies "let Baal strive," that is, with him, and expresses scorn and contempt at the impotence of Baal, whose altar Gideon had with impunity destroyed, Judg. vi. 28-32. Gideon is thence called Jerubbesheth. 2 Sam. xi. 21.—The name *Bedan* is found elsewhere only in 1 Chr. vii. 17 as name of a descendant of Manasseh, who is, however, of no historical importance. In the Book of Judges, to whose contents this part of Samuel's address (especially ver. 10) unmistakably points, there is no judge of this name; but the connection shows that a judge is here meant. The name has been read Ben-Dan = "the Danite," as *Samson* was born in Dan, Judg. xiii. 2 (Kimchi), and at the same time a play of words on his corpulence [Arab. *badana*] has been also supposed (Böttch.). But against this last Thenius rightly remarks that a name resting on a word-play would by no means suit this serious discourse; against the first (apart from the form) is the fact that Samson is never so-called, as must have been the case if the people were here to understand the name. Gesenius (*Halle Lit. Z.* 1841, No. 41) regards the name as abbreviation of Abdon, and so Ewald, who understands the judge of that name (Judg. xii. 13). But this judge does not occupy the important place in the history which the connection calls for. Similarly we must reject the supposition that Jair of Gilead Judg. x. assumed to be a descendant of Machir (whose great grandson, 1 Chr. vii. 17, is Bedan) is here meant, since the connection of Jair and Machir is not proved; and the supposition that a judge omitted in the Book of Judges from his insignificance is intended, is untenable. The best expedient is to read (with Sept., Syr., Arab) *Barak*; for the letters of this name (ברק) might easily pass into the other (בדן) and the error be perpetuated by copyists. But Barak is one of the most prominent judges along with those here mentioned. The historical-chronological order is not strictly observed in ver. 9 also. Barak represents with Deborah that heroic Israelitish band that (Judg. iv.) broke the power of Sisera and delivered Israel out of the hand of the Canaanites.—The fact that, after Jeph., Sam. names *himself* as the fourth representative of the divine deliverance is *not* so surprising as it is thought by the Syr. and Arab. versions and a Greek manuscript (Kennicott in the Addend. to his *dissert. gener.*) which put *Samson* instead, and also by Thenius, who, though the Sept. and Vulg. have *Samuel*, accepts the former reading because Samuel does not speak of *his own* times till the next verse. Samuel could mention himself without exciting surprise, because he was conscious of his high mission as judge and deliverer, and the profound significance of his office for the history of Israel was universally recognized. By this mention of himself he honors not himself, but the Lord, who had made him (like Moses and Aaron before) what he was, comp. ver. 6-9. Besides, it was under him that the yoke of the forty years' dominion of the Philistines was broken, which work of deliverance Samson was only able to begin. Samuel includes himself as an instrument of the divine deliverance, because over against him the demand for a king involved the rejection of the Lord (viii. 5), and so the sin against the Lord in that demand appears in the clearest light; and this, after having pointed *secondly* to the repeated wonderful deliverances of Israel out of the hand of enemies by these messengers of God, and *thirdly* to the quiet and security which they were enabled to attain in the land, he sets before them in ver. 12. These words expressly declare that Ammonitish attacks on the territory of Israel were the first occasion of the demand for a king as leader in war, comp. viii. 20. Clericus well remarks: "It hence appears not improbable that Nahash had made incursions into the Hebrew territory before the Israelites had demanded a king, and after his election had returned and begun the siege of Jabesh. It often happens in these books that circumstances omitted in their proper place are mentioned where they less properly belong." **And yet the Lord your God is your king.**—By such deliverers He had shown Himself anew their king; this He was by the covenant, and this He remained by His covenant-faithfulness. With the same declaration Gideon (Judg. viii. 23) exhibits the inadmissibility of His elevation as king, and Samuel the sinfulness and the unjustifiableness of their demand for a king.

Vers. 13-18. The *third section* of this transaction: in view of the fact that God has actually established a king in accordance with their demand, though it was a sinful and blameful one, Samuel declares a *truth*, which contains an *earnest warning*, namely, that, *if the people with their king will maintain the right relation to God* in fidelity and obedience to His will, the hand of the Lord will be *with* them both; in the contrary case, it will be *against* them both.—Ver. 13. *And now.* Here the discourse turns from the past and from the judgment of the people's conduct to the present *fact* of the established kingdom, which, with the words: **Behold the king** is taken as *starting-*

* [This account of Ashtoreth is in several points incorrect. The word (the etymology of which is not known) has no connection with ἀστήρ, and the Plu. Ashtaroth refers (like Baalim) to various god-modifications. See Rawlinson's "*Five Great Mon.*," I. 138, and Schrader "*Die Keil-Insch. u. d. Alt. Test.*" on Judg. ii. 11, 13.—Tr.]

point for the following *declaration* and the attached serious *warning and truth*. In this declaration is set forth the *origin* of Saul's kingly position—1) on its *human* side by the words: **whom ye have chosen, whom ye have demanded**—the discourse here goes *regressively* first to the *election* instituted by Samuel, and then to the *demand* made against him and God's will, and there is just here a progression in the thought;*—2) on its *divine* side by the words: **behold, the Lord hath set a king over you.**—Your demand sprang from an evil root, yet hath the Lord granted it; this king—though chosen and demanded by you—is yet alone a work of God; his election and establishment rests on the divine will and command. By these words is confirmed the truth that the *Lord* is and remains king (ver. 12). So far is that rejection (factually affirmed by the demand) from overthrowing Jehovah's kingdom, that the universal authority of the latter is rather now for the first time rightly declared in the installation of the sought-for king, and in his obligation and the people's to be subject to Jehovah and unconditionally obedient to His will. This point of view of the *absolute theocracy* comes out here the more clearly not only by the immediately preceding reference to the human side of the origin of the kingdom, but also by Samuel's declaration in ver. 1: "*I have made a king over you*," to which stands opposed the declaration: "*Behold, the Lord hath set a king over you.*" From this fact, that the installed king is a *gift* of the Lord, granted to the people's demand (comp. x. 19), follows now, in view of the *relation in which therefore people and king should stand to the Lord*, the *truth* and the *warning:* The well-being of both depends on faithful obedience to the Lord's will and word. The "if" introduces a *protasis* which includes all of ver. 14, and has no *apodosis*. The view that the latter has fallen out by similar endings, and read: "then he will save you out of the hand of your enemies" (Thenius) is not satisfactorily supported, and is not required to explain the aposiopesis, since the absence of the apodosis is easily explained by the length of the protasis, and its content apparent from the context="well," or "it will be well with you." A similar failure of the apodosis to be supplied from the connection is found in Ex. xxxii. 32. The assumption of an apodosis with וִחְיִתֶם [as in Eng. A. V.] in the sense, "then ye will follow the Lord," is untenable, partly from the tautology it makes in protasis and apodosis, partly from the expectation, awakened by the parallelism with the following sentence in ver. 15, of finding a promise set over against the threat. The voluntative sense of אִם =*modo*, "if only" (Keil) [="O that ye would only"], cannot be taken here, since it would then have the Imperf.† (Ew. § 329 *b*). Nor can we (with S. Schmid) connect ver. 14 with the last words of ver. 13: "The Lord hath set a king over you, if ye only will, *etc.;* but if not ....," since the conditioned character of the former clause would then require in it the Imperf. If (with Kimchi, Maurer) we read וִחְיִתֶם, "ye shall live," we cannot (with Maurer) translate: "who reigns over you after Jehovah" (that is, "next to Jehovah"), since this is an expression foreign to the Old Testament; nor (with Tremellius) supply "*sequentes*" [that is, "ye will live following Jehovah"]. If an apodosis be insisted on here (changing the text to וחיתם), we might perhaps read: "then shall ye live ... after Jehovah," which answers to the view expressed in the preceding words, of following God in obedience to His commands. But, retaining the text and supposing the apodosis omitted, Samuel here, in keeping with the importance of the moment and the emotion of his own heart, heaps together in most eloquent fashion the *demands* which are to be made on *religious-moral life* in view of the *conditions of true well-being* for the people and their king in the new order of things: *to fear the Lord, serve* Him, *hearken* to His voice, *not rebel* against His word (comp. Deut. i. 26, "rebel against the mouth [commandment] of the Lord"), and be after him, or, *remain in His retinue true to Him.* About the last words Keil rightly remarks (against Thenius) that היה אחר "to be after" is good Hebrew, and especially is often used in the sense, "to attach one's self to the king, hold to him," comp. 2 Sam. ii. 10; 1 Kings xii. 20; xvi. 21. This expression corresponds completely to the thought underlying this exhortation, namely, that the Lord, in spite of Israel's rejection of Him by the demand for an earthly-human king, is and remains the King of His people (vers. 12, 13).

Ver. 15. The contrast: **But if ye will not**—(from the preceding are recapitulated only the two traits of *obedience* to the word of the Lord and *not rebelling* against His commandment)—**then will the hand of the Lord be against you, as it was against your fathers.***—This comparative addition looks to the words from ver. 7 to ver. 12, wherein is pointed out how the fathers had brought on themselves by sin and defection the oppression of the enemy, in which the hand of the Lord was heavy on them, and from which the people now hoped to be delivered by the kings. At bottom the defection of the fathers and the demand for a king who was to deliver from oppressions sent by God for their sins, are one and the same wrong against the Lord. Therefore Samuel wishes by his earnest warning to lead them to repentance.—Ver. 16 gives the transition to a miraculous confirmation of that realness of

* On the weakening of the *a* to *e* in שְׁאֶלְתֶּם, see Gesen. § 64, 3, Rem. 1.

† [It has the Imperf. here, and might express a wish but that the construction in ver. 14 is clearly the same as that in ver. 15, which is conditional.—Tr.]

* *Not* "and against your kings," "fathers" being taken="kings" (D. Kimchi), nor (with Sept. and Thenius) "and your king," but (with Chald., Syr., Arab., Cler., Maur., Keil) retaining the harder reading of the text, and taking the ו as comparative [="as," so Eng. A. V.], in support of which is the fact that it sometimes introduces and connects loosely with the preceding whole sentences, the thought in which is subordinate, explanatory, or comparative, Ew. 340 *b*. It is properly to be explained: "*And* it was against your fathers,"—which is shortened into: "and against your fathers," whence is suggested a comparison. [Instead of this somewhat forced explanation it is better either to adopt the reading of the Sept., or to suppose the ו "and" to be an error for כ "as". We might expect in ver. 15 the mention of the king.—Tr.]

the divine holiness and righteousness, with which Samuel, his gaze fixed on the future, has just directed his exhortation to the people in the form of the announcement of a sentence. "*Even now*" connects the following with the preceding, so that 1) the picture of a judicial scene, which was introduced in ver. 7, is continued in the following narration, and 2) the signification of the next related fact is closely connected with that of the previously spoken words. The "now also" or "even now" refers back to ver. 7, where the judidicial scene is introduced with the same words: "and *now* stand forth, that I may reason with you." The reasoning continues thence through all the stages of the discourse, which the people have up to this moment heard, and is completed in the fact announced by Samuel [that is, the thunder-storm.—Tr.], in which they are to behold the Lord's judgment on their sin in the matter of the king.—Ver. 17. **Is it not wheat-harvest to-day?** This question signifies that at that season (in May or June) rain was unusual. So testifies Jerome on *Am.* iv. 7 [and *Rob.* I., 429-431.—Tr.]. After the barley-harvest (2 Sam. xxi. 9; Ruth i. 22; ii. 23) followed the wheat-harvest, vi. 13; Gen. xxx. 14; Judg. xv. 1.—"*To give voices*," said of Jehovah, = "to thunder," Ps. xlvi. 7; lxviii. 34; xviii. 14; Ex. ix. 23. Thunder is called the voice of the Lord, Ps. xxix. 3 sq. Samuel announces a storm with thunder and rain as a God-given *sign*, by which the Israelites should perceive that they had grievously sinned against God in asking a king. The "voices" = thunder answer to the "voice" and "mouth" in ver. 15.—Ver. 18. At Samuel's request this sign of His anger and His punitive justice, as manifestation of His kingly glory, takes place.—The result is that the people are seized with *great fear of the Lord and of Samuel; "of Samuel"* is added because he, as before by his word, so by his introduction of this manifestation, wonderful and contrary to the ordinary course of nature, of God's wrath, had displayed himself as instrument of the judicial power and glory of the God-king.

Vers. 19-25. *Fourth* section of Samuel's dealing with the repentant people. Confession of sin, comfort and exhortation to the humbled people.

Ver. 19. Their overwhelming fright and terror of soul leads first to the prayer to Samuel to call on the Lord that He might mercifully spare them. **That we die not,**—the presence of the holy and just God has made itself known to the people. Before Him the sinner cannot stand, His judgment must reach him. The "for" supplies the basis to the thought contained in what precedes, that they had deserved the punishment of the angry God. Their penitent confession is not merely the admission that they had asked a king, but *that they had added to all their sins this evil.* Ver. 20. *The word of consolation:* **Fear not,** in contrast with: "and all the people greatly feared" (ver. 18). To his consoling word Samuel adds 1) the reference to their sin, which, in order to retain them in wholesome sorrowful repentance, he anew sets before them in its whole extent ("*ye have done all this wickedness*"), and 2) the *exhortation, negative:* **only turn not aside from following the Lord** (the "from after" points back to the "after" in ver. 15); *positive:* **Serve the Lord with all your heart,** the undivided, complete devotion of the heart, the innermost life to the Lord is inseparably connected with not turning aside from Him.—Ver. 21. *Warning* against apostasy to *idol-worship*. **And turn ye not aside** [after vanities which do not profit]. (*Text-criticism.*—The difficulties in the כִּי "for" after וְלֹא תָסוּרוּ are not set aside by supplying תָסוּרוּ or תֵּלְכוּ, as many ancient and modern expositors do [so Eng. A. V.—Tr.]. According to this view, the ground of the resumed warning would be here given: "for ye go (if ye do that, namely, turn aside from the Lord) after vanities." But then something is adduced as ground of the warning which is implicitly its object; besides, apart from the hardness of the insertion, the resumption of the "turn not aside" with וְ "and" is a difficulty. Looking at the following כִּי, it becomes probable that this one was by mistake inserted a line before. It is rendered in *not one* of the ancient versions (Then.). It is wanting in Luther's version also. The omission of the כִּי gives a good, clear sense and an advance suitable to the lively character of the whole discourse. The "Turn not aside from the Lord" [ver. 20] is continued in the "Turn not aside after vanities," for apostasy to idolatry is the consequence of apostasy from the Lord. The former is introduced with אַךְ אַל ("only do not") in the form of urgent request, hearty wish, the latter as a categorically-determined negative with לֹא, ("not."). *Idols* are described as תֹּהוּ, "naughty, vain" (=הֶבֶל), as in Isaiah xliv. 9 the idol-makers. They cannot *help* nor *deliver*, because they are simply, *tohu*, nothing, vanity.—[Comp. 1 Cor. viii. 4.—Tr.]—Ver. 22 is factually the reason why they are not to fear (ver. 20); but formally this verse is the ground of the preceding exhortation; they are not to forsake the Lord and turn aside from Him and serve idols, because *the Lord will not forsake them as His people*, which is said in contrast with the vain idols, which cannot help and deliver, because they are "naught," while the Lord's "*great name*" is to be the pledge that He will not forsake them. The words: **for his name's sake** are explained by and based on the declaration: **for it hath pleased the Lord** (כִּי הוֹאִיל), not "the Lord hath *begun*," but "he has by free determination taken the first step thereto, it *pleased* him" (comp. Judg. xvii. 11; Josh. vii. 7; Ex. ii. 21).—**To make you his people.**—This embraces all God's *deeds*, by which He has established Israel in history as *His people*, the deeds of choice, deliverance out of Egypt, covenanting, introduction into the promised inheritance, preservation from enemies—by these deeds He has glorified *His name*, which is the expression of all God's revelations of salvation and power to His people. The *ground* of this is found simply in the *determination of the free, loving will of God*—הוֹאִיל, comp. Deut. vii. 6–12, which furnishes a complete parallel to the train of thought here. Of the vain idols it is said in ver. 21 לֹא יוֹעִילוּ [lo yoilu, "they do not profit"], of the Lord here הוֹאִיל [hoil, "he

did kindly, it pleased him"], a paronomasia of pregnant meaning. The *name* of the Lord, therefore, that by which He has made Himself this name in His relations to His people, and that which thence resulted, the dignity of the people as the Lord's people and their appertainment to Him as His *property* is the *pledge* that He will not leave His people. "His people" and "make you His people" are corresponding expressions, they are *His* people because He has *made* them His people. Comp. Psalm c. 3; xcv. 7; Deut. vii. 6, 9, 18.—Ver. 23. Samuel promises the people his personal mediation and aid, partly through the *priestly* function of *intercession* for them, partly through the exercise of his *prophetic* office in showing them the *right way*. The "as for me too" refers to the "Jehovah" in the preceding verse, and to the close connection into which the people (ver. 19) had brought his name with the name of the Lord. The assurance of his intercession follows on the *request* in ver. 19: "Pray for thy servants." Both passages put Samuel's prayer-life anew in a clear light (comp. vii., viii.). By the solemn asseveration "far be it," he points to the *importance* which he himself attributes to his intercession for the people. The word "sin" indicates his *obligation before the Lord* to intercede; to neglect this would be a sin against the Lord; for, as mediator between God and the people, he must enter the Lord's presence in whatever concerned them, for weal or for woe. Comp. his work of prayer in chs. vii., viii. The "not ceasing" indicates his *persistency* in intercession.—Along with this priestly mediation Samuel promises also his constant *prophetic* watch-care, which consists in "*showing the good and right way*," that is, the way of God. The predicates "good and right" show that moral conduct is referred to, and that according to the will and law of the Lord (so Ps. xxv. 4). The instruction is to be given to king as well as people. —Ver. 24. Samuel, having spoken of his person and his personal office, now directs the people's look from his *person* and work to the **Lord**, and holds up anew before king and people the great *Either—Or: either* ye will fear the Lord and serve Him and ye will experience the salvation of your God,—*or*, ye will do evil and—both of you will be destroyed. The discourse culminates in a condensed statement of what is said in vers. 14, 15. The "in truth, with all your heart," exhibits the double character of the service of God, of truth and of innerness, in contrast with the service of outward appearance and dead works. Since this exhortation to fear and serve God relates to the general religious-moral life of the people, we cannot refer the confirmatory declaration: **For ye see what great things he hath done for you** to the extraordinary natural phenomenon narrated in ver. 18. The *mighty deeds* of the Lord here referred to are those mentioned in vers. 6, 7 sqq., to which reference is repeatedly made in all these transactions relating to the king (viii. 8; x. 18), from which most frequently is drawn the motive for true fear of God and obedience to His will, because by them God established and confirmed His covenant relation with Israel as His people, and so the people owed Him covenant-fidelity and obedience as their God.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. *Review* of the history of the introduction by Samuel of the Israelitish monarchy under Saul (chaps. viii.—xii.). The following are its *principal stadia*, in the general and special development of which the well-adjusted connection between the several sections becomes apparent. In chap. viii. *Samuel* confers with the *people* concerning their *demand* for a king, and receives in *prayer* the *revelation* from the Lord that he should listen to the people's demand and give them a king. In chap. ix. 1–17 is set forth the providence of *the Lord*, whereby in the *person of Saul* the divinely *chosen* and appointed king of Israel is led to Samuel, and is designated as such by a special revelation from the Lord. Chap. ix. 17—x. 16, *Samuel* as *instrument* of the *divine call* which came to *Saul;* Saul receives from Samuel first the *announcement* of his high calling by the Lord (vers. 17–27), then the *consecration* to the royal office by anointing, and the assurance of his call by reference to appointed signs therefor (x. 1–8), and finally the *confirmation* and *strengthening* of his divine call together with qualification for it by the Spirit of the Lord (vers. 9–16).—Chap. x. 18–27. *Samuel* and the *people* in the assembly at *Mizpah* for the *public presentation* of the God-chosen king, which is followed by a partial recognition only on the part of the people.—Chap. xi. Saul's *proclamation* and *general recognition* as king of Israel in consequence of his heroic deed of deliverance from the Ammonites, and also his *solemn installation* at *Gilgal*.—Chap. xii. *Samuel*, in a solemn, affecting *final conference* at *Gilgal*, after a justificatory review of his official career, places *people and monarchy* under the government of the Lord, as their king, and obligates both to obey His will.

2. "Samuel yields to the desire of the people because he knows that now God's time has come; but at the same time he makes every effort to bring the people to a consciousness of their sins. If it were true that Samuel considered the monarchy in itself incompatible with the theocracy, how very differently he must have acted! In that case, when the whole people, deeply moved by his discourse and by the confirmatory divine sign, said: "Pray for thy servants to the Lord thy God, for we have added to all our sins the evil of asking a king" (ver. 19), he must have insisted that the old form be straightway re-established. But he is far from doing this. He rather exhorts the people to be from now on faithful to the Lord, who would glorify Himself in them and their king." Hengstenberg, *Beitr.* 3, 258 sq. [Contributions, *etc.*].

3. At Gilgal [chap. xii.] Samuel stands at the highest point of his work as instrument of the divine guidance and government of his people, and as mediator between the people and God as their king and lord. As *prophet* he leads king and people together into the presence of the Lord, calls forth in the people by a moving discourse the deep feeling of sin and the penitent confession of guilt, places king and people under God's royal majesty and legal authority, and obligates them to inviolable obedience to the will of the Lord. As *judge* he, at God's command, installs

the asked-for king, makes the people solemnly confirm the self-justifying declaration which he with invocation of God and the king had made, conducts the Lord's cause against the unfaithful people by reasoning with them and accusing them, exhibits in thunder and storm the majesty and the wrath of the despised invisible king, decrees weal and woe, salvation and destruction to king and people, according to the regard which they hereafter show to the exhortations and instructions which he had given them as prophet. In this sense, in spite of the termination now of his official functions as judge, he remains a judge over king and people. And there is, besides, his *priestly* position, in which he again presents himself between the Lord and His people, with the assurance and promise that he will ever intercede for them, and would sin by not interceding. The people so needed him as long as he lived.

4. The Lord's mighty deeds towards and for His people, their apostasy to unfaithfulness and idolatry, punishment for their sins in oppression and misery, cry to the Lord for help in time of need, repentance and confession of sins, new exhibitions of the Lord's grace, these are *in constant sequence the chief features of the history of the kingdom of God in Israel*, here briefly sketched (vers. 7-12), and in the *Book of Judges* detailed at length.

5. *The mention of the Lord's manifestations of grace and revelations of power for His people*, which is here heard from Samuel, and remains throughout all prophecy a standing element of prophetic preaching, has as its *aim:* 1) to glorify the name of God, to bring out clearly His covenant-faithfulness, and to exhibit the people's high calling as chosen people and God's property; 2) to show more strikingly the people's sin in unfaithfulness, unthankfulness and disobedience, and thereby to bring them to acknowledgment of their sin; 3) to induce sincere repentance and penitent return to the Lord; 4) to show the penitent people the source of consolation and help, and to fix in their hearts the ground of hope for future salvation; 5) to make more effective admonitions and warnings respecting the maintenance and attestation of their covenant-faithfulness.

6. *The truth* and *the fact: "The Lord your God is your King"* (ver. 12), notwithstanding its subjective obscuration in the consciousness of the people, whence proceeded the demand (sinful in its motives and moral presuppositions) for an earthly-human kingdom, has lost so little objectively in validity and importance that now, in the outset of the history of the kingdom granted by God in accordance with this desire, it rather comes out more clearly, since monarchy and people are placed under the immediate royal authority of God (vers. 13, 14), and both people and king (the two embraced as a unit in this point of view, ver. 14), exhorted to like obedience to His royal will, and threatened with like punishment from the Most High King as their Judge (vers. 14, 15, 25). The rejection of the God-king by the demand for a man-king led to a higher stage of development of the theocracy, on which, over against and by means of the earthly kingdom, there was of necessity a so much the more glorious unfolding of the royal honor of God.

7. God's manifestations of grace and salvation to Israel are often regarded in the Old Testament under the point of view of *righteousness*, and called by this name, as in ver. 7. But this "righteousness" is *not* then (as is often done) to be taken as ="goodness," "benefit," and the like, for these are different conceptions; *nor* as="faithfulness," "trustworthiness," so far as God fulfils to His people the promises which He gives as covenant-God. The ground of this designation of the divine gracious kindnesses is given in the *relation* in which *God* as covenant-God stands to His people; established by own free grace and His absolute loving will (ver. 22), it is the *norm*, according to which *the people over against him* walk in the obedience due to His holy will (ethical righteousness), and on the other hand *the Lord over against His people* reveals to them the love and goodness which belong to them as His possession by virtue of the gracious rights established by Him, imparting to them gifts and benefits of grace partly as a promised blessing, partly as reward of faithful and obedient fulfilment of covenant-obligations (Ps. xxiv. 5; xxii. 32; Mic. vi. 5). In accordance with this, God in His deliverances exercises His *righteousness* (which gives each his own) as King of His people on the ground and according to the norm of the covenant-relation established by Himself in His own free grace (vers. 14, 15, 24, 25). Comp. 1 John i. 9: "God is faithful and *righteous* to forgive us our sins." After the completion of the economy of salvation in Christ, God's *righteousness* is exhibited, *along* with His faithfulness, in the bestowment on the penitent sinner of the gracious gift of forgiveness of sins as something which *belongs* to him by the right accorded him by free grace, since God has ordained that he who penitently confesses his sins shall find pardon.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 1–6. How a servant of God should, after the example of Samuel, rightly perform *the duty of maintaining his personal honor and innocence* against unjust accusations: 1) By a clear and true statement of his own course of life and behaviour (vers. 1, 2); 2) By a bold appeal to the knowledge and conscience of others (vers. 3, 4); 3) By a solemn invocation of the all-knowing God as the best witness. [Vers. 2, 3. Samuel a statesman and civil and military ruler, living in times of cruel warfare, political changes, social corruption, and general relaxation of morality; he can solemnly appeal to God and man for the absolute integrity of his official conduct through all the years (particularizing that—*a*) he has not seized their property, *b*) defrauded them, nor *c*) inflicted personal violence, and *d*) has not taken bribes); and all the people (vers. 5, 6), and God Himself (ver. 18), fully confirm the claim. A notable example, often needed.—HALL: No doubt Samuel found Himself guilty before God of many private infirmities; but, for his public carriage, he appeals to men. A man's heart can best judge of himself; others can best judge of his actions. Happy is that man that can be acquitted by himself in private, in public by others, by God in both.—SCOTT: The honor rendered to those who are concluding their course, differs widely from the applause and congratulation which many receive when they first step forth before the public eye.

This, indeed, often terminates in disgrace and contempt.—Tr.]

Vers. 7–12. *Think of former times:* 1) That we may with shame remember the Lord's many manifestations of grace and benefits; 2) That we may be penitently conscious of the sins committed against the Lord; 3) That we may humbly acknowledge the ground of all evils and distresses in our own guilt; 4) That we may honestly turn to the obedience of faith towards the Lord. [Vers. 7–12. Hall: Samuel had dissuaded them before—he reproves them not until now. .... We must ever dislike sin—we may not ever show it. Discretion in the choice of seasons for reproving is not less commendable and necessary than zeal and faithfulness in reproving.—Tr.]

Vers. 14, 15. *With whom or against whom is the hand of the Lord?* The answer to this question depends on the following considerations: 1) Whether one has, or has not, given himself to be the Lord's with his whole *heart*—*a*) in true *fear* of God, *b*) in true *service* of God; 2) Whether one is, or is not, in his *will* thoroughly *obedient* to the will of the Lord, *a*) *hearkening* unconditionally to His word, *b*) *not resisting* His commandments; 3) Whether one is, or is not, in his whole *walk ready to follow* the Lord in His *guidance*—*a*) keeping in the way pointed out by Him, *b*) keeping in view the goal set up by Him.

Vers. 13–15. *True unity between king and people, authorities and subjects:* 1) As being *holy* it is *closely bound* by the hand of the King of all kings in establishing the *covenant between the two* (ver. 13; 2) As being *deeply grounded* it is *rooted* in the common obligation of both alike to fear God, serve God, obey God (no true unity without right fear of God, humble service of God, faithful obedience to God) (ver. 14); 3) As *unshakable and abiding* it is *maintained* in times of heavy assaults, when both are tempted to apostasy, unbelief and disobedience (ver. 15 *a*); 4) It *shows itself ever firmer* in view of the Lord's threatenings and promises to both.

Vers. 14–19. *The hard speech of God against sinners:* 1) Why it is *necessary*—because men are hard-hearted, hard of hearing, cross-grained; 2) How it makes itself *heard*—in the earnest exhortations of His holy love (ver. 14), in the threatenings of His righteous wrath (ver. 15), in alarming natural events (vers. 16–18); 3) What is its *aim*—acknowledgment of sin (ver. 17), fear of God (ver. 18), seeking God's grace (ver. 19).—Vers. 19–21. *To whom applies the divine word of consolation, Fear not:* To those who—1) penitently confess their sins before God, 2) humbly acknowledge God's punishments as well-merited, 3) eagerly seek God's grace and mercy; 4) are willing to serve the Lord in faithful obedience.

Vers. 20, 21. *The exhortation to fidelity, Turn not aside from the Lord.* Turn not aside—1) When experiencing His punitive justice, but have childlike confidence in His forgiving love; 2) When harassed by natural inclination to resist His will, but serve Him in faithful obedience through the power of His Spirit; 3) When tempted to fall away by the world which is sunk in the service of vanity, but bravely withstand the idolatry of the ungodly world.—Vers. 20, 21. *A threefold word of exhortation to penitent sinners:* 1) A word *reminding* of past sin ("Ye have done all this wickedness"); 2) A word consolingly *pointing* to the divine grace ("Fear not"); 3) A word *exhorting to fidelity* ("Turn not aside from the Lord"), which, with the *warning* against the idolatry of the vain world contains a *demand* to serve the Lord alone with all the heart.—Ver. 22. *The Lord forsakes not His people*—for 1) He has made His people His *possession*—*a*) by choice out of free grace, *b*) by covenanting with them in faithful love; 2) He has made Himself a great *name* among His people, *a*) by His wonderful deeds in the past, *b*) by the promises of His word for the future.—Ver. 23. *The highest service of love which men can do one another:* 1) *Intercession* for each other before the Lord; 2) *Pointing* to the good and right way.—*Ceasing to intercede* for our brethren *a sin against the Lord:* 1) Because the souls of our brethren as members of His people are His possession; 2) Because the Lord demands intercession as a sign and fruit of love, which flows from the fountain of His paternal love, and in which men as His children are to keep themselves before Him; 3) Because the Lord, in that community of life in which He has placed us, often gives us special occasion and necessity to pray for our brethren. [Henry: Samuel promises more than they asked. (1) They asked it of him as a favor—he promised it as a duty. (2) They asked him to pray for them at this time, and upon this occasion, but he promises to continue his prayers for them, and not to cease as long as he lived. (3) They asked him only to pray for them, but he promises to do more, to teach them also "the good and the right way," the way of duty, the way of pleasure and profit. —Tr.]

Vers. 24, 25. *Fear the Lord:* 1) What sort of fear the true fear of God is. 2) On what it is *grounded* ("great things"). 3) Whereby it *manifests itself* (serving Him). 4) From what it *preserves* (from temporal and eternal destruction). [Henry: And two things he urges by way of motive: (1) *Gratitude*, considering "what great things he had done for them;" (2) *Interest*, considering what great things He would do against them, if they should still "do wickedly."—Tr.] Vers. 22, 25. Harless (*On Hallowing the Sabbath*, I., 113): *The hope of genuine national prosperity.* Where then is the ground for hope of genuine national prosperity? Where there is 1) Fear of God's Name; 2) Confidence in God's Name.

SECOND DIVISION.

KING SAUL'S GOVERNMENT UP TO HIS REJECTION.

CHAPTERS XIII.—XV.

FIRST SECTION.

The Unfolding of his Royal Power in Successful Wars.

CHAPTERS XIII.—XIV.

I. *Against the Philistines.* Chap. XIII.—XIV. 46.

1 SAUL reigned one year; and when he had reigned two years over Israel, [Saul
was —— years old when he began to reign, and he reigned —— years over Israel].[1]
2 [*Ins.* And] Saul chose him three thousand *men* [*ins.* out] of Israel, *whereof* [*om.*
whereof, *ins.* and] two thousand were with Saul in Michmash and in mount [the
mountains of] Bethel, and a thousand were with Jonathan in Gibeah of Benjamin;
3 and the rest of the people he sent every man to his tent [tents].[2] And Jonathan
smote the garrison of the Philistines that was in Geba, and the Philistines heard of
it. And Saul blew the trumpet throughout all the land, saying, Let the Hebrews
4 hear.[3] And all Israel heard say that Saul had smitten a garrison[4] of the Philis-
tines, and that Israel also was had in abomination with the Philistines. And the
5 people were called together after Saul to Gilgal. And the Philistines gathered
themselves together to fight with Israel, thirty[5] thousand chariots, and six thousand
horsemen, and people as the sand which is on the seashore in multitude; and they
6 came up, and pitched in Michmash eastward from [over against] Bethaven. When
[And] the men of Israel saw that they were in a strait (for the people were dis-
tressed), then [and] the people did hide [hid] themselves in caves and in thickets
7 [caverns][6] and in rocks and in highplaces [hollows][7] and in pits. And *some*[8] *of the*

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. The translation of Eng. A. V. is untenable, and that given in brackets is the only possible one. The numerals have fallen out, and can be only approximately restored. The plu. שָׁנִים would indicate that the period of Saul's reign was less than ten years, but, in the present corrupt state of the text, no such inference can safely be drawn. The omission of this verse in the Sept. may have been from its absence in their MS., or from their inability to make sense of it, or from clerical inadvertence. It is better to leave the numerals blank, and explain in a note that they have fallen out. Some, however, think (Hitzig, Maurer, Thenius, Wellhausen) that the numbers were designedly left out by the author.—TR.]

[2] [Ver. 2. Here the Heb., in accordance with universal O. T. usage, has the plural.—TR.]

[3] [Ver. 3. The Syr., Arab., Vulg., Chald., here sustain the Mas. text. The reading of the Sept. is discussed by Erdmann. Wellhausen proposes to read: "and Saul blew the trumpet throughout the land, and the Philistines heard, saying, The slaves revolt (פָּשְׁעוּ)," the words "saying, *etc.*" being taken as a gloss.

[4] [Ver. 4. A different Heb. word from that used in xiv. 1, though from the same verbal stem. It is used also in x. 5; xiii. 3; 2 Sam. viii. 6, 14; 1 Chr. xi. 6. Ewald renders "officer," distinguishing נְצִיב (Sept. *Νασίβ*) from נִצָּב.—TR.]

[5] [Ver. 5. This number is generally regarded as too large. Some suppose baggage included (Patrick), some the chariot-soldiers (Cahen and others, comp. 2 Sam. x. 18), others suppose an error of text and read 3 for 30 (Clarke, Syr., Arab.), or 300 (*Bib. Comm.*). Still other conjectures are given in Poole's Synopsis.—TR.]

[6] [Ver. 6. The lexicons generally render "thickets," as Eng. A. V. and Erdmann; Fürst renders "clefts," and Ewald reads חורים "caves." But Chald. has "fortresses," Syr. and Vulg. "secret places," and Sept. "enclosures" or "holes." Of the modern versions Luther and Diodati have "clefts," Spanish follows Vulg., the French (of Martin), Port., Dutch agree with Eng. A. V. Other German versions give "hedges," "thorn-bushes," "clefts." The renderings of the ancient versions make Ewald's reading probable, and this sense accords better with the context.—TR.]

[7] [Ver. 6. So the ancient versions. The moderns generally render "towers" (so Erdmann), which is supported by the Arab. *sarhun.* The word occurs only three times in O. T., twice rendered in Eng. A. V. "hold" (Judg. ix. 46, 49) and here "high-place," which, as is remarked in *Bib. Comm.*, is an unfortunate rendering, liable to be confounded with the places of religious worship.—TR.]

[8] [Ver. 7. Literally, "Hebrews went over," so Syr., Chald., Vulg. The Sept. has *οἱ διαβαίνοντες* (הָעֹבְרִים) and Symmachus *οἱ ἐκ τοῦ πέραν.* The mas. text does not suit the context, that of Sept. is against Heb. usage, and that of Symmachus (מֵעֵבֶר) is unsupported. Wellhausen proposes ועברו מעברות הירדן "and they crossed the fords of the Jordan," which gives a good sense with a very slight change in the letters. Throughout this nar-

Hebrews went over Jordan to the land of Gad and Gilead, as for [and] Saul he
[*om.* he] was yet in Gilgal, and all the people followed him trembling.
8 And he tarried seven days according to the set time that Samuel had appointed[9];
9 but Samuel came not to Gilgal; and the people were scattered from him. And
Saul said, Bring [*ins.* me] hither [*om.* hither] a [the] burnt-offering to me [*om.* to
10 me] and [*ins.* the] peace-offerings. And he offered the burnt-offering. And it
came to pass that, as soon as he had made an end of offering the burnt-offering, be-
11 hold, Samuel came; and Saul went out to meet him that he might salute him. And
Samuel said, What hast thou done? And Saul said, Because I saw that the people
were scattered from me, and that thou camest not within the days appointed [at the
appointed time], and that the Philistines gathered themselves together at Michmash,
12 Therefore said I, The Philistines will [Now will the Philistines] come down now
[*om.* now] upon me to Gilgal, and I have not made supplication unto the Lord
[Jehovah], [*ins.* And] I forced myself therefore [*om.* therefore], and offered a [the]
13 burnt-offering. And Samuel said to Saul, Thou hast done foolishly [*ins.* in that][10]
thou hast not[11] kept the commandment of the Lord [Jehovah] thy God, which he
commanded thee; for now would the Lord [Jehovah] have established thy kingdom
14 upon [over] Israel for ever. But now thy kingdom shall not continue; the Lord
[Jehovah] hath sought him a man after his own heart, and the Lord [Jehovah]
hath commanded him to be captain over his people, because thou hast not kept that
which the Lord [Jehovah] commanded thee.
15 And Samuel arose and gat him up from Gilgal unto Gibeah[12] of Benjamin. And
Saul numbered the people that were present with him, about six hundred men.
16 And Saul and Jonathan his son and the people that were present with them abode
in Gibeah [Geba][12] of Benjamin, but [and] the Philistines encamped in Michmash.
17 And the spoilers came out of the camp of the Philistines in three companies: one
company turned unto the way that leadeth [*om.* that leadeth] to Ophrah, unto the
18 land of Shual; And another company turned the way to Bethhoron; and an-
other company turned *to* [*om.* to] the way of the border[13] that looketh to the valley
19 of Zeboim towards the wilderness. Now there was no smith found throughout [in]
all the land of Israel; for the Philistines said, Lest the Hebrews make them swords
20 or spears. But [And] all the Israelites went down to the Philistines, to sharpen
21 every man his share and his coulter and his axe and his mattock.[14] Yet [And] they

rative the Hebrews (apparently recreant Israelites) seem to be distinguished from the Israelites (who followed Saul).—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 8. This word is not in our Heb. text, but אמר is found in several MSS. and printed editions; others have שם which De Rossi suggests has fallen out from resemblance to the two initial letters of the following word שְׁמוּאֵל. On the critical objections to this section, vers. 8–15 *a*, see Erdmann's Introduction.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 13. Several MSS. and printed eds. insert ו and Sept. has ὅτι.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 13. Hitzig proposes unnecessarily to point לֻא instead of לֹא.—Tr.]

[12] [Vers. 15, 16. It is somewhat surprising that Samuel goes to Gibeah (ver. 15), while Saul is found in Geba (ver. 16) without previous mention of his having gone thither. Instead of Geba the ancient vss. have Gibeah, and are followed by Eng. A. V. and Erdmann. Robinson (quoted in *Bib. Comm.*) thinks Geba correct. A good sense is gotten by connecting 7 *a* with 15 *b*. The readings of the Sept. are discussed by Keil and Erdmann.—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 18. It is objected, but without sufficient ground, that the word שקף ("stretches towards, looks, overhangs") cannot be used of "border." The Sept. has "hill" (גבעה).—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 20. No satisfactory rendering has yet been given of this ver. and the following. The names of the instruments are given differently in different versions, there is doubt about the meanings of the names, the Sept. has a different text in ver. 21, and the initial words of this ver. in the Heb. and the connection of the two verses are yet obscure. The simplest reconstruction of the text would be to consider ver. 21 as an erroneous repetition of ver. 20, and omit all except the last two words (of the Heb.); but this would not account for the difference in form of the two verses, and is rendered difficult by the retention in all the versions of ver. 21 in full. In order to exhibit the differences of the Heb. and the Sept., we set them here down together, giving the latter conjecturally:—

H.—וְהָיְתָה הַפְּצִירָה פִים לַמַּחֲרֵשֹׁת וְלָאֵתִים וְלִשְׁלֹשׁ קִלְּשׁוֹן וּלְהַקַּרְדֻּמִּים וּלְהַצִּיב הַדָּרְבָן

G.—וְהָיָה הַבָּצִיר נָכוֹן לִקְצוֹ (לַמַּחֲרֵשׁוֹת or) וְהָאֵתִים שָׁלֹשׁ שֶׁקֶל לַשֵּׁן וְלַקַּרְדֹּם [וְלַמַּחֲרֵשָׁה] הַצִּיב אֶחָד בָּם

The translation of the Greek is: "And the vintage was ready, and their tools were three shekels to the tooth, and for the axe and the sickle there was the same rate (or character)." The Sept. thus substantiates in the main the consonants of the Hebrew, but gives no clear sense; the price of sharpening tools, three shekels to the tooth (adopted by Aquila and Thenius) is enormous, and the reference to the harvest, while it is suggestive, is unclear. The Heb., on the other hand, offers a meaningless repetition in ver. 21, and the ungrammatical 'הפ, the compound שׁלשׁ and the disconnected two last words present great difficulties. A sense may be gotten by putting the three first words of ver. 21 at the beginning of ver. 20, and considering the names in ver. 20 as repeated from ver. 21. But, before stating this reading, let us look at the names of implements. The first, which is the same in both

had a file for the mattocks, and for the coulters, and for the forks, and for the axes,
22 and to sharpen the goads. So [And] it came to pass in the day of battle[15] that
there was neither sword nor spear found in the hand of any of the people that were
with Saul and Jonathan; but with Saul and with Jonathan his son was there found.
23 And the garrison of the Philistines went out to the passage [pass] of Michmash.

CHAP. XIV. 1. Now [And] it came to pass upon a day that Jonathan the son of
Saul said unto [to] the young man that bore his armor, Come, and let us go over
to the Philistines' garrison, that is on the other side. But [And] he told not his
2 father. And Saul tarried [was lying] in the uttermost part of Gibeah under a po-
megranate tree in Migron,[16] and the people that were with him were about six hun-
3 dred men, And[17] Ahiah, the son of Ahitub, Ichabod's brother, the son of Phinehas,
the son of Eli, the Lord's priest [priest of Jehovah] in Shiloh, wearing an [the]
4 ephod. And the people knew not that Jonathan was gone. And between the pas-
sages [passes] by which Jonathan sought to go over unto the Philistines' garrison
there was a sharp rock on the one side and a sharp rock on the other side; and the
5 name of the one was Bozez, and the name of the other Seneh. The forefront of the
one was situate northward [The one rock was a column[18] on the north] over against
Michmash, and the other southward [on the south] over against Gibeah [Geba].[19]
6 And Jonathan said to the young man that bare his armor, Come, and let us go over
to the garrison of these uncircumcised; it may be that the Lord [Jehovah] will
work for us; for there is no restraint to the Lord [Jehovah] to save by many or by
7 few. And his armorbearer said unto him, Do all that is in thine heart; turn
8 thee,[20] behold, I am with thee according to thy heart.[21] Then said Jonathan [And
Jonathan said], Behold, we will pass over unto *these* [the] men, and we will [*om.*
9 we will] discover ourselves unto them. If they say thus unto us, Tarry [stand still]
until we can come to you, then we will stand still [*om.* still] in our place and will
10 not go up unto them. But, if they say thus, Come up unto us, then we will go up,
for the Lord [Jehovah] hath delivered them into our hand; and this shall be a [the]
11 sign unto us. And both of them [the two] discovered themselves unto the garrison
of the Philistines; and the Philistines said, Behold, the Hebrews come forth [there
12 are Hebrews coming forth] out of the holes where they had hid themselves. And
the men of the garrison answered Jonathan and his armorbearer and said, Come up
to us, and we will show [tell] you a thing [something]. And Jonathan said unto
his armorbearer, Come up after me, for the Lord [Jehovah] hath delivered them

verses (except apparently in the Chald.), is rendered "share" (Sym., Vulg.) "scythe" (Syr.), "cutting-tool" (Ch.), "ox-goad" (Theod.), and is probably best given as "share" or "coulter," though the authority for "scythe" is good. The second name is probably "spade" or "hoe" (so Chald. (?), Sym., Vulg., Kimchi, Winer, Ewald, comp. Isa. ii. 4); Saalschütz (*Arch.* I., 103–105) prefers "sickle," from Isa. ii. 4. The third name is undoubtedly "axe." The fourth name (which is almost identical in form in the Heb. with the first), is rendered "trident" (Aq.), "bident" (Sym.) "scythe" (Sept.) "goad" (Syr.) "coulter" (Vulg.), and is apparently a repetition by mistake of the first name, or of the last word in ver. 21; if it be the correct reading it is best rendered "coulter." In ver. 21 the third name is usually given as "trident," but by Syr. as "scraper." The words are suspicious and may perhaps be properly read לְשַׁלֵּב קִ (or לִלְטֹשׁ). In the beginning of ver. 21 the second word must drop its Article (perhaps repeated from preceding word), and take the construct. form.—The following reading, then, might be proposed: "And there was bluntness of edges to the shares and hoes, and all Israel went down to the Philistines to sharpen every man his share and his hoe, and to sharpen the point of his axe, and to fix his goad." This rendering would account for the Sept. treatment of the latter half of ver. 21, for the repetitions of names, and for the Chald. rendering ("goad") of the first name in ver. 20. It would be necessary to suppose that the dislocation of the words took place very early, before the Sept. translation was made. But such dislocation is hard to account for, and it might be better to suppose a parenthesis and read: "And all Israel went down to the Philistines, to sharpen every man his share and his hoe and his axe and his coulter (for there was bluntness of edges to the coulters and hoes and tridents and axes) and to fix the goad" which is very unsatisfactory, but perhaps the best that the present text permits.—TR.]

15 [Ver. 22. Sept. here inserts "of Michmash," which is supported by the construct. form מִ, but is against Heb. usage, which would give "the day of Michmash" (Wellhausen). There is here a duplet, מלחמת and מכמש. On the alleged contradiction between ver. 22 and ver. 2 see Exegetical Notes.—TR.]

16 [Ver. 2. Sept. Μαγδών, Syr., Geb'un, Vulg., Magron. The word means "threshing-floor," Arab. mijran.—TR.]

17 [Ver. 3. This verse may be taken as an independent parenthetical sentence.—TR.]

18 [Ver. 5. Thenius thinks this word (which is not in Sept.) superfluous, and probably a repetition of the following word; but Syr., Chald., and Vulg., read apparently as the Mas. text.—TR.]

19 [Ver. 5. So the Heb.; but the versions have "Gibeah," which, says Stanley, is plainly a mistake.—TR.]

20 [Ver. 7. So Syr., Chald., Vulg. (*perge quo cupis*), but the Sept. has "do all that thy heart inclines to," and this is adopted by Erdmann. The Heb. expression is somewhat hard, but not impossible. Syr. read לֵךְ "go," instead of לָךְ "to thee."

21 [Ver. 7. Sept.: "as thy heart is my heart," which is better. The Heb. phrase alone may mean "according to thy desire," but this would require a verb before it.—TR.]

13 into the hand of Israel. And Jonathan climbed up upon [on] his hands and upon
[on] his feet, and his armorbearer after him; and they fell[22] before Jonathan, and
14 his armorbearer slew after him. And that first slaughter which Jonathan and his
armorbearer made was about twenty men, within, as it were, an half acre of land,
which a yoke *of oxen might plow* [within about a half-furrow of a yoke of land].[23]
15 And there was trembling in the host [camp], in the field, and among all the people;
the garrison and the spoilers they also trembled, and the earth quaked, so [and] it
[*om.* it] was [became] a very great trembling [a trembling of God].
16 And the watchmen of Saul in Gibeah of Benjamin looked [saw], and behold, the
multitude melted away and they went on beating down *one another* [*om.* and . . .
17 another, *ins.* hither[24] and thither]. Then said Saul [And Saul said] unto the people
that were with him, Number now, and see who is gone from us. And when they
had numbered [And they numbered and] behold, Jonathan and his armorbearer
18 were not there. And Saul said unto Ahiah, Bring hither the ark[25] of God [the
ephod]; for the ark[25] of God was at that time with [for he bore the ephod at that
19 time before][26] the children of Israel. And it came to pass, while Saul talked unto
the priest, that the noise that was in the host [camp] of the Philistines went on and
[*om.* and] increased [increasing]; and Saul said unto the priest, Withdraw thy
20 hand. And Saul and all the people that were with him assembled themselves
[shouted][27] and they [*om.* they] came [advanced] to the battle; and behold, every
21 man's sword was against his fellow, and there was a very great discomfiture. More-
over [And] the Hebrews[28] that were with the Philistines [*ins.* as] before that time,
which went up with them into the camp *from the country* round about [*om.* from . . .
about], even [*om.* even] they also *turned*[28] [turned] to be with the Israelites that
22 were with Saul and Jonathan. Likewise [And] all the men of Israel which had hid
themselves in mount [the hill-country of] Ephraim when they [*om.* when they]
heard that the Philistines fled, [*ins.* and] even [*om.* even] they also followed hard
23 after them in the battle. So [And] the Lord [Jehovah] saved Israel that day. And
the battle passed over unto Beth-aven.

24 And the men of Israel were distressed that day.[29] For [And] Saul had [*om.* had]
adjured the people saying, Cursed be the man that eateth any [*om.* any] food until
evening, that I may be avenged on mine enemies. So [And] none of the people
25 tasted any [*om.* any] food. And all *they of* [*om.* *they of*] the land came to a [the]
26 wood, and there was honey upon the ground. And when [*om.* when] the people
were come [came] into [unto] the wood,[30] [*ins.* and] behold, the honey dropped [was
flowing]; but [and] no man put his hand to his mouth, for the people feared the oath.
27 But [And] Jonathan heard not when his father charged the people with the oath,
wherefore [and] he put forth the end of the rod that was in his hand, and dipped
it in an honey-comb, and put his hand to his mouth, and his eyes were enlight-
28 ened.[31] Then answered one of the people [And one of the people answered] and

[22] [Ver. 13. Sept. ἐνέβλεψαν = וַיִּפְנוּ.—Tr.]

[23] [Ver. 14. For this unintelligible reading Thenius ingeniously proposes בְּחִצִּים וּבְצוּר הַשָּׂדֶה "with darts and stones of the field," from which both Heb. and Sept. may be constructed.—Tr.]

[24] [Ver. 16. For וַיֵּלֶךְ read (with Sept.) הֲלֹם; so Erdmann.—Tr.]

[25] [Ver. 18. The improbability of the ark's being in the field, the impropriety of the phrase "*bring* the ark," and the general use of the ephod in inquiring of God (as in 1 Sam. xxx. 7) recommend the Sept. reading "ephod," the Heb. word for which differs only slightly from that for "ark." Erdmann retains "ark."—Tr.]

[26] [Ver. 18. For the same reasons the Sept. reading is adopted here. The Heb. וּבְנֵי is an error for עִם בְּנֵי, or לִפְנֵי בְּנֵי; the latter is adopted by Erdmann ("the ark was in the presence of Israel"), who otherwise follows the Heb.—Tr.]

[27] [Ver. 20. So Syr., Vulg., Then., Erdmann (Qal); Chald. and Sept. as Eng. A. V. (Niphal).—Tr.]

[28] [Ver. 21. Sept. incorrectly δοῦλοι. Note here the contrast between Hebrews and Israelites. The Eng. A. V. has correctly "turned" (סָבְבוּ), but renders the same word (סָבִיב as it incorrectly stands in the Heb. text) again "round about."—Tr.]

[29] [Ver. 24. For the insertion of Sept. see Exeget. Notes.—Tr.]

[30] [Ver. 26. This verse is little more than a repetition of the preceding. Syr. in Walton (but not in Lee) omits 26 *a*. Sept. reads: "And Jaal was a wood abounding in bees, on the face of the field, and the people went into the place of bees, and lo, they went on talking," where they read דבר for דבש; but Wellhausen's emendation: "And there was honey on the ground, and the people went into the wood, and bees were moving" is doubtful. The passage is difficult.—Tr.]

[31] [Ver. 27. So the Qeri instead of Kethib "saw."—Tr.]

said, Thy father strictly charged the people with an oath, saying, Cursed be the
29 man that eateth *any* [*om.* *any*] food this day. And the people were faint.[32] Then
said Jonathan [And Jonathan said], My father hath troubled the land; see, I pray
you, how mine eyes have been enlightened, because I tasted a little of the honey.
30 How much more if haply [*om.* haply] the people had eaten freely to-day of the
spoil of their enemies which they found! for had there not been now a much greater
31 slaughter [for now had not the[33] slaughter been great] among the Philistines? And
they smote the Philistines that day from Michmash to Aijalon [Ajjalon]; and the
people were very faint.

32 And the people flew upon the spoil, and took sheep and oxen and calves, and
33 slew them on the ground; and the people did eat them with [on] the blood. Then
[And] they told Saul, saying, Behold, the people sin against the Lord [Jehovah]
in that they eat with [on] the blood. And he said, Ye have transgressed [acted faith-
34 lessly]; roll a great stone unto me this day [roll me a great stone hither[34]]. And
Saul said, Disperse yourselves among the people, and say unto them, Bring me
hither every man his ox, and every man his sheep, and slay them here, and eat;
and sin not against the Lord [Jehovah] in eating with [on] the blood. And all the
35 people brought every man his ox with him[35] that night, and slew them there. And
Saul built an altar unto the Lord [to Jehovah]; the same was the first altar that
36 he built unto the Lord [to Jehovah].[36] And Saul said, Let us go down after the
Philistines by night, and spoil them until the morning-light, and let us not leave a
man of them. And they said, Do [*om* Do] whatsoever seemeth good unto thee [*ins.*
do]. Then said the priest [And the priest said], Let us draw near hither unto God.
37 And Saul asked counsel of God, Shall I go down after the Philistines? wilt thou
deliver them into the hand of Israel? But [And] he answered him not that day.
38 And Saul said, Draw ye near hither, all the chief [heads] of the people, and know
39 and see wherein this sin hath been this day. For, as the Lord [Jehovah] liveth,
which [who] saveth Israel, though it be[37] in Jonathan my son, he shall surely die.
40 But [And] there was not a man among all the people that answered him. Then
said he [And he said] unto all Israel, Be ye on one side, and I and Jonathan my
son will be on the other side. And the people said unto Saul, Do [*om.* Do] what
41 seemeth good unto thee [*ins.* do]. Therefore [And] Saul said unto the Lord [Je-
hovah] God of Israel, Give a perfect *lot*.[38] And Saul and Jonathan [Jonathan and
42 Saul] were taken; but [and] the people escaped. And Saul said, Cast lots between
me and Jonathan my son.. And Jonathan was taken. Then [And] Saul said to
43 Jonathan, Tell me what thou hast done. And Jonathan told him, and said, I did
but taste [I tasted] a little honey with the end of the rod that was in mine hand;
44 *and* [*om.* and] lo, I must die. And Saul answered [said], God do so and more also,
45 for [*om.* for] thou shalt surely die, Jonathan. And the people said unto Saul,
Shall Jonathan die, who hath wrought this great salvation in Israel? God forbid
[Far be it]; as the Lord [Jehovah] liveth, there shall not one hair of his head fall
to the ground, for he hath wrought with God this day. So [And] the people res-
46 cued Jonathan that he died not. Then [And] Saul went up from following the
Philistines, and the Philistines went to their own place.

II. *Against the other Enemies round about—especially the Amalekites.* Chap. XIV. 47–52.

47 So [And] Saul took the kingdom over Israel, and fought against all his enemies
on every side, against Moab, and against the children of Ammon, and against Edom,
and against the kings of Zobah, and against the Philistines; and whithersoever he
48 turned himself he vexed them. And he gathered an host [grew in strength], and

[32] [Ver. 28. A parenthetical clause, apparently inserted by mistake from ver. 31.—Tr.]

[33] [Ver. 30. This word should have the Art. in the Heb.—Tr.]

[34] [Ver. 33. Read הֲלֹם (Sept.) instead of הַיּוֹם.—Tr.]

[35] [Ver. 34. Sept. "what was in his hand."—Tr.]

[36] [Ver. 35. Literally: "It (or as to it) he began to build an altar to Jehovah," an obscure phrase.—Tr.]

[37] [Ver. 39. The masc. pron. (referring to a fem. noun) may be defended as having an indefinite reference. According to Thenius the Sept. read יַעֲנֶה (ἀποκριθῇ).—Tr.]

[38] [Ver. 41. For discussion of the text of this passage see Exeget. Notes.—Tr.]

smote the Amalekites, and delivered Israel out of the hands of them that spoiled
them.
49 Now [And] the sons of Saul were Jonathan and Ishui [Ishwi][39] and Melchishua;
and the names of his two daughters *were these* [*om. were these*], the name of the first-
50 born Merab, and the name of the younger Michal. And the name of Saul's wife
was Ahinoam, the daughter of Ahimaaz, and the name of the captain of his host
51 was Abner, the son of Ner, Saul's uncle. And Kish was [*om.* was] the father of
Saul, and Ner the father of Abner was the son [were sons[40]] of Abiel.
52 And there was sore war against the Philistines all the days of Saul; and when
Saul saw any strong man, or any valiant man, he took him unto him.

[39] [Ver. 49. "For ישוי the Sept. read ישיו — אשיו — אש־בעל — איש־בשם" (Wellhausen). Ishyo was equivalent to Ishbaal at a time when the name Baal (lord) was used of the God of Israel. Afterwards, from repugnance to the false Baal-worship, Bosheth was substituted for Baal.—Tr.]

[40] [Ver. 51. The change to the plural is rendered necessary by 1 Sam. ix. 1 and 1 Chron. ix. 36.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The connection of chap. xiii. 1 sq. *with what precedes* is not to be explained as a resumption here of the narrative which was dropped in x. 16. In support of this view Thenius affirms that it is only by supposing an original immediate connection between xiii. 2 and x. 16 that the words of Samuel, x. 7, "when these signs come to thee, undertake confidently what occasion may suggest," have a definite reference; but there is such a reference in chap. xi. already in the deed there done by Saul. And, when the same expositor makes Saul, inspired by the patriotic hymns of the prophets, proceed straightway to free his people from the yoke of the Philistines, he takes for granted what is not suggested in the words, and puts too much into them.—Against the view that the real continuation of the narration ending with x. 16 is not given till now (the section x. 17–xii. 25 containing matter foreign to the connection) Keil (*Comm.* p. 90, Rem. 1 [Eng. Tr., p. 122, Rem. 1]) admirably remarks that, on this supposition, it is inconceivable that Saul, who on his return from Samuel to Gibeah concealed his royal anointing from his kinsfolk (x. 16), should straightway have entered on his public career by choosing 3000 men and beginning the war against the Philistines—or further, that Saul should have had such universal, complete respect as is supposed by the people's pouring to him as king on his call, unless he had before been publicly proclaimed king in the presence of all Israel, and had won by a public deed the recognition and confidence of the whole people—and, finally, that the narrative in xiii. 1–7 requires the intermediate events of x. 17–xii. 25 in order to be intelligible.—But this view of the real and historical connection between xiii. sq. and x. 17–xii. 25 does not exclude the possibility that the redactor of the book from xiii. on used another authority than that employed in the previous history of Samuel, one, namely, which treated of Saul's reign and rejection; though, on the other hand, it is more probable that the editor of the book (which is derived from several sources) here uses the same authority for Saul's life as in chap. ix., speaking more at length of his deeds and official life, after having introduced from the source relating to Samuel what was required to continue the narrative, and set forth the historical events in their objective pragmatical connection.

Ver. 1. The chronological statements at the beginning of Saul's official life correspond to the usual notices of the age and time of reign of the kings at the outset of their history (comp. 2 Sam. ii. 10, 11; v. 4 and the many similar places in the books of Kings). We should therefore expect a different datum from that of the text: "Saul was one year old when he became king, and he reigned two years." And the attempts to extract sense from the present text, at least the first part of the verse, must be pronounced, partly on linguistic, partly on factual grounds, utter failures; so that of Luth., Grot., Cler., v. Gerlach [Eng. A. V.]: "Saul had been king one year," and the Chald.: "Saul was as an innocent child; when he became king." The text (which is presupposed even in the Sept.) is certainly corrupt, in the first place, in the first half, and a number must be supplied between בֶּן and שָׁנָה. Nägelsbach supposes (Herz. XIII., 433) that a ן = 50 has fallen out after בֶּן by reason of the double Nun; to which it is no objection (Thenius) that then Saul, supposing that he reigned 20 years, would have been 70 when he went into his last battle (xxxi. 6), but great difficulty arises from the statement of Saul's youth (ix. 2). Others, as Bunsen, Vaihinger (Herz. VIII. 8) supply a מ = 40, supposed to have fallen out from the following similar שׁ, which would suit both the statement in xiii. 5, that Jonathan was already a stout warrior, and that in ix. 5. This first statement about Jonathan makes it impossible to accept the supplement ל = 30 (in an anonymous version in the Hexapla).—In the second half of the verse many try to retain the text "and he reigned two years over Israel" by construing it syntactically with ver. 2, and explaining, with Grotius, that Saul collected his armed band after having reigned two years. So also Clericus: "As, twelve months and some more after birth one may be said to be the son of one year and living in his second year, so, the whole of one year of reign and the greater part of the second having elapsed, one may be called a king of one year, who was reigning two years." But ver. 1 cannot form a syntactic unit with ver. 2, unless the subject *Saul* were omitted in ver. 2, which would be arbitrary. Here, too, we must suppose a gap left by the omission of a numeral; and it is highly probable that כ = 20 has fallen out, so that the duration of the entire reign was given as in other cases. But the supposition (taking the text without connection with ver. 2)

that Saul reigned altogether only *two* years, hardly deserves mention; it is shown to be absurd by the summary statement in xiv. 47 of Saul's wars.*

I. *The principal war against the Philistines.* xiii.; xiv. 1-46.

1. Vers. 2-7. The *introduction* of the war. That this war occurred in the *beginning of Saul's reign* is highly probable from the statement at the end of ver. 2, that he sent the rest of the people home. For here a gathering of the whole arms-bearing population is presupposed, from which *three thousand* men were *chosen*, and it is natural to infer, since nothing has been said of any general summons of the people except for the Ammonite war (chap. xi.), that on this latter followed soon the war against the Philistines narrated in xiii., xiv.—The statement, "And Saul chose him three thousand men out of Israel," indicates an *important fact* for Saul's military rule: *The formation of a standing warlike body of chosen men into a permanent disciplined army in distinction from the mass of the people, who had hitherto been summoned to war.* This body of 3000 men was so divided between Saul and his son Jonathan (who is here mentioned for the first time) that the former had command of 2000, and the latter of 1000. This is indicated by the "with" (עִם), and it is therefore unnecessary to insert with Thenius a "which" (אשׁר) after "two thousand" (אַלְפַּיִם) "because Saul himself could have been only in one place."† —*Michmash*, according to *Rob.* II. 328 sq. [Am. ed. I., 440-442, and see Grove in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, *s. v.*—Tr.] the present desolate village *Muchmash*, 3½ hours [nearly 9 Eng. miles, but Grove says 7—Tr.] northeast of Jerusalem on the northern cliff of the narrow pass which runs between it and Geba (which was on the southern range of heights), the present Wady Suweinit. The mountain or mountain-range of *Bethel*, which along with Michmash was a post of the 2000 men under Saul, can be none other than the range (Josh. xvi. 1) on which the old Bethel lay (comp. 1 S. x. 3). The ruins of Beitin, on the old site of Bethel, and surrounded by mountains, are 3¾ hours [9½ or 10 Eng. miles] from Jerusalem. The two posts were thus not far from one another, and had probably about the same altitude.—The other division, of 1000 men, was at *Gibeah* of Benjamin, the home of Saul's family, under Jonathan's command.—The reason for the dismissal of the rest of the people was partly, no doubt, that Saul did not venture to advance against the Philistines with an undisciplined mass, and that no compact body, but only a strong garrison here marked the borders of the Philistine power and authority.—Ver. 3. Jonathan's heroic deed. **He smote the garrison of the Philistines in Geba.** There is no reason for reading Gibeah (though the ancient vss. so have it) instead of Geba; for this reading is obviously an attempt to correct the text which (from Gibeah in ver. 2) was supposed to be incorrect. Whether this garrison was the same as that mentioned in x. 5, which was perhaps, in consequence of the Israelites' occupying Michmash, removed to Geba opposite, is uncertain. Jonathan with his thousand men inflicted a total defeat on this garrison of the Philistines. The word "smote," from its ordinary military use and from the context, can here mean nothing but a "slaughter." Saul and Jonathan's first movement may have been concealed from the Philistine garrison by the nature of the ground, or may have been so sudden as to be like a surprise;* and, as to the narrative, it was not necessary to go into details on the method and result of this military blow, because it is considered merely as the beginning and occasion of the decisive struggle against the Philistines. It is therefore unnecessary to regard נְצִיב as "pillar," sign of the authority of the Philistines (Then.), or as the name of a Philistine *officer* whom Jonathan slew, (Ew.), or as a proper name (Sept.). Aquila has correctly ὑπόστημα, *statio*.—The word "saying" (לֵאמֹר) usually, where as here it is connected with blowing a trumpet, introduces what is to be publicly proclaimed after the sounding of the trumpet, comp. 2 Sam. xx. 1; 1 Kings i. 34, 39; 2 Kings ix. 13. We might accordingly say that Saul ordered it to be proclaimed by sound of trumpet through the land: "Let the Hebrews hear." Then would follow (from the connection) the story of Jonathan's heroic deed. These words would in that case be the usual introduction to what was to be made known, as among us in public proclamations accompanied by musical instruments, there are first words to call attention.† The herald would then give the event to be proclaimed simply and clearly.—But it is an equally well-supported view, that what is said is merely that Saul had the important fact proclaimed by trumpet throughout all Israel, without quoting the words of the proclamation, and that the "saying" introduces (as usual) only the words or thoughts of the subject of the sentence. That is: Saul blew the trumpet in all Israel, saying (or thinking), The Hebrews shall hear it, namely, the deed of Jonathan. We need not, therefore, in any case, with Thenius, following the Sept. ἠθετήκασιν οἱ δοῦλοι, "the slaves have revolted,"‡ put "revolt" (יִפְשְׁעוּ) for "hear" (יִשְׁמְעוּ) and render: "Let the Hebrews *revolt*, free themselves." Nor does the "revolting" suit the presupposed relation of the Hebrews to the Philistines. The words of Josephus, quoted by Thenius: "He proclaims it throughout the whole land, summoning them to freedom," contain an explanatory, paraphrastic remark on what was of course understood in the public proclamation in consequence of Jonathan's feat, and cannot therefore furnish a basis for a change of text. But that in fact the content of the proclamation was not a summons to revolt, but the state-

* [Some suppose that the numerals, being unknown to the editor (who lived long afterwards), never were in the text. But neither the omission of ver. 1 in Sept. nor the resemblance of שׁתי (for שׁני) to שׁנים requires this supposition, which on general grounds is not probable. —Tr.]

† [Thenius (following Sept.) renders "2000, which were partly in Michmash, partly in Bethel."—Tr.]

* [One of the translators who has visited the spot points out that the attention of the garrison would naturally be directed to Saul's force at Michmash, which was very near them on the north; and thus Jonathan, who was several miles distant on the southwest, could more easily effect a surprise.—Tr.]

† [*Bib. Comm.* compares our Oyez, oyez.—Tr.]

‡ The untrustworthiness of this is shown by the δοῦλοι, which has arisen by confounding עִבְרִים with עֲבָדִים.

ment of Jonathan's blow, appears from ver. 4: with the trumpet-proclamation went throughout Israel the *news:* **Saul** (that is, as chief commander, head of the military force, a part of which had inflicted the blow) **has smitten the garrison of the Philistines.**—At the same time the people became aware of the *consequence and significance* of this attack on the position of the Philistines: Israel, it is said, had become *stinking*, that is, suspected or hated with the Philistines (comp. xxvii. 12; Gen. xxxiv. 20; Ex. v. 21), by their purpose to shake off, arms in hand, the foreign yoke. The enkindled hate and anger of the Philistines must needs have led them to a speedy military undertaking against Israel, as is narrated in ver. 5; and Israel was thereby compelled quickly to gather all its strength against the Philistines. This *military summons* of the whole people is expressed by וַיִּצָּעֲקוּ [called]: **The people were called together (summoned) after Saul to Gilgal.** Vulg., Sanctius, Luther translate incorrectly: "cried" [instead of "were called together"]. The summons took place at the same time with the trumpet-announcement. Saul went to *Gilgal*, the old camping-place, because the people were to assemble there, and indeed could only assemble behind the steep declivities of the hills in the broad plain which stretches to the Jordan.—Ver. 5. To this movement of Israel answers *the rapid gathering of a large army by the Philistines.* Most expositors regard the number of chariots (30,000) as too large in proportion to the number of horsemen (6,000), and (comparing similar numbers in 2 Sam. x. 18; 1 Kings x. 16; 2 Chron. xii. 3) suppose an error of text here. According to Thenius the Codex 715 of De Rossi has (originally) simply "a thousand" (אֶלֶף).* It is "a natural conjecture that the sign for 30, ל, has been repeated from the preceding word, and we then read 'a thousand chariots'" (Bunsen). The supposition of three thousand chariot-warriors (Syr., Calov., Hez., Schulz, Maur.) is arbitrary, and unsustained by 2 Sam. x. 18.—The large army of the Philistines (one thousand chariots, six thousand horsemen) **encamped in Michmash** (which Saul had left) **in front of Bethaven.** The locality is disputed among modern expositors. In the first place, against Jerome who (on Hos. v. 8, Bethaven, *quæ quondam vocabatur Bethel*) identifies Bethaven with Bethel, the distinctness of these two places is, according to Josh. vii. 2, to be maintained; according to this passage, Bethaven lay east from Bethel, and according to Josh. xviii. 12 there was a "wilderness of Bethaven." We must first inquire how we are to understand "over against" (קִדְמַת). If we assume that this expression "in *geographical* statements always means *east*" (Then)., it yet by no means follows, as Then. thinks, that Michmash was very near the *Jordan*, far from Gibeah. Apart from the groundless identification of Gibeah and Geba (the former, Jonathan's position, was nine* miles farther south), there is between Bethaven (east of Bethel) and the Jordan so considerable a distance, that Michmash may well have lain east from Bethaven, without being "very near the Jordan," and therefore farther from Geba than the narrative permits. It is, therefore, unnecessary (with Keil), in order to meet Thenius' objection, to render קִדְמַת "*in front of*," though to this there is no objection, since the *constant* geographical expression for "east" is מִקֶּדֶם, and the identity of the two neither has been nor can be shown (from Gen. ii. 14; iv. 16; 1 Sam. xiii. 5; Ezek. xxxix. 11, the only places in which our word occurs); and so Ewald, *Bib. Jahrb. X.* 54 (comp. Keil on Gen. ii. 14). In Isa. x. 29 Gibeah-Benjamin (along with Ramah) is named with Geba in such a way that the latter appears as a strong camping-place, which had to protect the two other places, and from which their territory was commanded. If, now, Saul (according to ver. 2) was posted northward at Michmash and Jonathan southward at Gibeah-Benjamin, the Philistine position at Geba would be between them; certainly the double Israelitish position was intended to embrace the Philistine garrison on both sides. Jonathan having destroyed this garrison by a *coup de main*, and the Philistines having marched to Michmash in great force (ver. 5), Saul was obliged to abandon this position (which was now after Jonathan's feat of no importance to him), and betake himself to the old camping-plain at Gilgal, that he might here assemble the people to war, while Jonathan kept his position at Gibeah-Benjamin (xiv. 16, 17), whence he performed a second bold feat against the camp of the Philistines at Michmash. Thenius reads *Beth-horon* instead of Bethaven, on the ground that the Philistine camp would probably be pitched in the fertile region around *Gibeon;* but both these places lie too far west to suit this narrative, and the Philistines, in changing their camp at Michmash (ver. 23), would certainly march eastward in the valley between Michmash and Geba. The people were afraid of them (vers. 6, 7), because they were apprehensive that the Philistines would advance from Michmash into the Gilgal-plain, and overpower them, unprepared as they were.—"And the men of Israel saw that they were in a strait (*in angustiis*), because the people were pressed by the Philistines." This recognition of danger and fear of a superior force expresses itself in three ways. *Partly, they hid themselves* in the country this side of the Jordan in *caves*,† *thorn-bushes* (why thick bushes (from חוֹחַ, *thorn*) should not serve for hiding (Then.) is not obvious), in *clefts* of rocks, in *watch-towers* or castles (the word is found elsewhere only in Judg. ix. 46, 49, where it is distinguished from *migdal*, "tower," and is a high, isolated, roofed building, perhaps designed to guard against military attacks. Clericus: "fortified places; they are high places, fortified on a lofty site, as appears from the Arabic, in

* [So De Rossi states in his *Var. Lect.*, and also mentions that Bochart, Capellus and Houbigant favor the reading of Syr., Arab., 3,000. Wordsworth suggests that the Philistines hired chariots from other nations (1 Chron. xix. 6, 7). Rashi, Radak, Ralbag say nothing. —Tr.]

* [Gibeah was not nine miles southwest of Geba, but about four miles; see the maps of Robinson and Porter, and Erdmann's statement on xiv. 16. Tr.]

† [On these names see "Textual and Grammatical," *in loco*.—Tr.]

which the word means any lofty structure") and in *pits; partly* (ver. 7), *they flee* across the Jordan into the land of *Gad* and *Gilead* (Clericus: "regions toward the source of the Jordan, mountainous and more difficult of access for the Philistine army"), while Saul still remained at Gilgal; we see from this, as well as from the expressions *down* and *up* (vers. 12–15), that this Gilgal could not have been the elevated Gilgal or Jiljalieh between Sichem and Jerusalem, which also would be impossible from the military positions here mentioned of the Philistines and of Saul; *partly*, they go trembling *after* Saul, that is, the soldiers, who were there as one body under his command (אַחֲרָיו). It thus appears that the Philistines advanced against the Israelites with rapidity and energy in strong force, to avenge themselves and establish their authority; and that among the Israelites there was great dismay and confusion.

2. Vers. 8–14. Saul's hasty offering in opposition to the divine arrangement, and, in consequence of this, his rejection by Samuel's prophetic judicial sentence.—Ver. 8. Saul *waited** according to x. 8 seven days for Samuel to come and make the offering for the people who were arming themselves for the war against the Philistines. After "which" supply "appointed" (יעד or אמר, Sept., Chald.), 2 Sam. xx. 5. Comp. Ew. § 292 *b*.—**But Samuel came not to Gilgal**, that is, during the *seventh* day; the people were scattered from him partly through fear of the Philistines, partly from the failure of the hope held out by Saul that Samuel would come.—Ver. 9. Saul makes the offering, or causes it to be made, without waiting longer for Samuel. The fear that he would become entangled in battle before the people were thereto consecrated by offering and prayer, and apprehension of the complete dispersion and disheartenment of the people drove him (ver. 12) to this disobedience and this overhaste.—Ver. 10. **When the offering was finished, behold, Samuel came**, from the context, on the same day on which Saul had waited for him in vain and made the offering. In his impatience in the presence of the prepared enemy Saul had not waited to the end of the appointed day.—Vers. 11, 12. *Samuel's question:* **What hast thou done?** is an earnest reproof to Saul for his self-willed violation of the divine arrangement which had been prophetically made known to him. In defence Saul pleads *three* things: the dispersion of the people, the danger of a sudden descent of the Philistines into the plain of Jericho, and the possibility of being obliged to go into battle without divine consecration and blessing. The Heb. phrase (חל, *etc.*) is literally "to *stroke* the face of Jehovah," in order to gain His favor and grace by offering or prayer. Comp. Ex. xxxii. 11. "*I forced myself*," did violence to my desire, took courage. Saul here intimates that it was only after a strong internal conflict that he determined to act contrary to the divine command.—Ver. 13. Two constructions may here be taken. The first clause may be conditional (לֹא=לוּא=לוּ), "if thou hadst kept," and the second (כִּי עַתָּה="yea, then!") the result: "yea, then would the Lord;" or the first may be simply declarative (לֹא="not"): "thou hast not kept," and before the second (כִּי עַתָּה, "yea, then would the Lord have established thy kingdom") we may supply the condition ["if thou hadst kept"] required by the sense. The latter is preferable from the whole situation, to which such liveliness of discourse better answers. Examples of such a construction, with omission of conditional protasis, are Ex. ix. 15; 2 Ki. xiii. 19; Job iii. 13; xiii. 19. See Ew., § 358 *a*. The twice (beginning of ver. 13 and end of ver. 14) repeated declaration: "thou hast not kept the commandment of the Lord," indicates the ground of the similarly twice (first hypothetically—then affirmatively) repeated judgment: "thy kingdom will not be established by the Lord, nor stand." It is therein assumed that Saul received through Samuel a divine direction, and that he had recognized Samuel's arrangement as a direction from God given him through the mouth of the legitimate mediator, which Samuel, as Prophet of the Lord, was. The content of the divine direction was this: Saul was to await the arrival of Samuel, who, not arbitrarily, but in accordance with his other (here unmentioned) prophetic work, determined the time at which the battle was to begin under the consecration and direction of the representative of the invisible King of Israel. Comp. x. 8: "that I may show thee what thou art to do." Saul had thus been directed to await the divine directions, and by his action here transgressed the *fundamental law of obedience* to his King; unquiet and impatient, self-willed and fleshly, he fails to stand the trial which lay in this command, and sets himself outside of the relation of unconditional obedience to the will of God, the humble fulfilment of which was the condition of the establishment and continuance of His kingdom. Samuel recognized with his prophetic look the disposition of heart which was at the bottom of Saul's conduct, on account of which neither he nor his house could be the permanent bearer of the kingdom. Samuel's judgment is therefore not hasty, unjust, harsh, as it has been thought, but the expression of the divine righteousness and holiness, as whose organ he stood over against Saul; and his conduct towards Saul corresponds exactly to his position (as we have heretofore seen him) as instrument of Israel's God-king. Samuel's judicial sentence signifies the *rejection* of Saul; *negatively*, it is the denial of what would have occurred, if Saul had fulfilled the required condition, the permanent establishment of His kingdom, *positively* it is the announcement that the Lord had chosen another as theocratic king in his stead. Back of this judicial act of Samuel stands as its motive the truth, brought to light by Saul's conduct, that Saul had forfeited the royal office committed to him; for the theocratic king must be, at the head of God's people, in full accord with the royal will of God. Cleric.: "Yea, the authority of the prophet, rather, of God Himself, was maintained—which, if Saul could with impunity neglect the most important commands, would afterwards have been despised by the obstinate people impatient of the yoke, and by the king himself."—Ver. 15.

* The Hiph. of Qeri, וַיּוֹחֶל, is clearly formed after Hiph. in x. 8, and Kethib, וייחל (Niph. or Pi) is to be retained. [On this section, vers. 8–15 *a*, see Erdmann's Introduction.—Tr.]

The 600 men, all that remained to Saul, shows that he could not in any case have avoided what he wished to avoid. The declaration, "thou hast acted foolishly," is thus confirmed. Saul's conduct was *foolish* because it of necessity produced the opposite of *that* which he was to gain by obedience and trust in God.

3. Vers. 15–23. Samuel's "*going up*" from the plain of Gilgal to the elevated *Gibeah*-Benjamin, Saul's home, is stated simply as a fact, and the reason not given. That Saul also went thither from Gilgal (Then.) is not necessarily supposed in the word "numbered." The mustering of his remaining troops is best placed in Gilgal; he there reviewed them in order now to march against the Philistines. The number of warriors was reduced to 600. Saul had therefore, by his hasty, disobedient conduct, not attained his purpose of holding the people together (ver. 11).—Ver. 16. Here the two positions on the opposite heights of Geba and Michmash, a deep gorge between them running eastward into the plain, are clearly and distinctly marked. The camp of Saul and Jonathan is said to be in *Geba* (the present Jeba, to be distinguished from Gibeah-Benjamin), without mention of Saul's march to Geba; the words "were encamped" rather introduce us into the midst of the situation. Between the words "from Gilgal" and "Gibeah-Benjamin" [ver. 15] the Sept. (not understanding the passage) inserts: "and the rest of the people went up after Saul to meet him after the men of war, they having come from Gilgal." So with some modification the Vulg.: *et reliqui populi ascenderunt post Saul obviam populo qui expugnabant eos venientes de Galgala.* But such a filling out is not needed in order to understand the connection. The author's task is not to give a complete, detailed history of this war, but to set forth from the theocratic point of view, in respect to Saul's conduct and God's dealing, what occurred. Having in respect to the former given a detailed account of the scene at Gilgal, without mentioning that Saul had gone from Michmash to Gilgal (which is *assumed* in ver. 4), it was sufficient, taking it for granted that Saul had moved from Gilgal to Geba, to state the fact that the camp of the Israelites was then in Geba, and thereby to indicate the new scene, in which in the following context the condition of subjugation of the Israelites by the Philistines under the divine permission is set forth. In this simply theocratic sporadic description, which corresponds to the cut-up nature of the land on which this occurrence took place, and to the immediate vicinity of hill and valley, we have from ver. 2 on a series of distinct pictures, without statement of their historical-geographical connection: 1) Michmash—Gibeah-Benjamin and Geba (vers. 2, 3); 2) Michmash—Gilgal (vers. 4–15); 3) Gibeah-Benj. and Geba-Benj.—Michmash. The *historical-geographical situation* is as follows: At first the Israelitish army in two divisions lay on the one side in Michmash, on the other side in Gibeah-Benjamin. From this point Jonathan smote the garrison or camp of the Philistines in Geba. In consequence of this the Philistines—who controlled the plain—collected their forces. Saul left Michmash and marched down to Gilgal in order there to gather Israel to the conflict against the Philistines, while the latter occupied Michmash deserted by Saul. While Samuel remained at Gibeah-Benjamin, Jonathan's former position, Saul and Jonathan took position over against the Philistines in Geba; that is, at the place where Jonathan had broken up the Philistine garrison.

Vers. 17–23. *The oppression of Israel by the Philistines.* In vers. 17, 18 the *devastation* of the Israelitish territory by Philistine raids is described. From the camp of the Philistines at Michmash went forth "the spoiler" (הַמַּשְׁחִית). The Article denotes that part of the army to which was assigned the task of plundering and devastation, and thus inciting to battle. There were three bands (רָאשִׁים—as in xi. 11). One of the bands took the *road* to *Ophra*, to the land of *Shual*. Ophrah was in the territory of Benjamin (Josh. xviii. 23), five Roman miles [1 Rom. mile=about 1618 English yards] *east* of Bethel (Onom.), conjectured by Rob. II. 338 [Am. ed. I. 447] to be the present Taiyibeh.* This band therefore moved *northward*. *Shual*, "Foxland," is probably the same with Shaalim, ix. 4. The second party went towards *Bethhoron* (Josh. x. 11), that is, *westward*. The third band moved in a *south-easterly* direction. This Zeboim (צְבֹעִים) is to be distinguished from the Zeboim (צְבֹיִים) of Deut. xxix. 22; Gen. xiv. 28; according to Neh. xi. 34 it was a city inhabited by Benjamites, and therefore in the Benjamite territory. The direction is given by the added words: "towards the wilderness," for this wilderness is doubtless no other than that of Judah, which extended east from Jerusalem. While, therefore, the Israelites under Saul and Jonathan held a strong point on the heights, the Philistines plundered the plains and valleys where they had the control.—Vers. 19, 20. Here they deprived the Israelites of arms; for "there was *no smith* found in all the land." The Philistines had broken up the smithies—for they said: "lest the Hebrews *make them swords or spears*." Only the implements necessary for agriculture were allowed them—to *sharpen* which they must go to the Philistines. So Porsenna allowed the Romans iron implements for agriculture only. Before "the Philistines" the Sept. inserts "the land of," which is merely an explanation of an unusual expression. The people signifies the land or territory (Ew. § 281 *d*). The meaning of the names of implements in ver. 20 cannot be determined with certainty. The first (מַחֲרֵשָׁה) from its etymology may be any cutting instrument. The fourth (מַחֲרַשְׁתּוֹ) Jerome renders *sarculum*, "hoe." The second (אֵת) is, as in Mic. iv. 3; Isa. ii. 4, "ploughshare," or "coulter." The third (קַרְדֹּם) is "axe" or "hatchet."—Ver. 21 shows the *consequence* (וְהָיְתָה) of the Hebrews having no smiths, and having to go to the Philistines to sharpen their tools. **And there was dulness**—properly notching of edges to the shares, *etc.*; or, there came edge-dulness to the shares. (פְּצִירָה from a stem which in Arab. means "cleave." As the Art. here and its absence in פִּים are both strange; and the st. abs.

* [Mr. Grove thinks this uncertain (Smith's *Bib. Dict.* s. v.).—Tr.]

stands instead of the st. const., it is probable that the text is corrupt, and (with Keil) to be read הַפְצִיר הַפִּים, Inf. Hiph. and rendered "so there occurred dulness of the edges," *etc.*) Bunsen says excellently: "The parenthesis indicates that the result of the burdensome necessity of going to the Philistines was that many tools became useless by dulness, so that even this poorer sort of arms did the Israelites not much service at the breaking out of the war." **And to set the goads.**—"To set" corresponds to "to sharpen," and completes the picture of the Hebrews' dependence on the Philistines in respect to agricultural implements. The previously mentioned implements (including the trident or fork) needed sharpening; the ox-goad needed new setting. The translation of De Wette: "*when*, namely, the edges ..... were dulled ..... " is certainly not tenable (Then.). On the other hand, neither this parenthesis, which describes the consequence of the oppression, nor the difference in the lists of implements, is so remarkable as to require the following of the text of the Sept. (Then. and Böttcher).—Ver. 21 reads thus in the Sept: "and the vintage was ready to be gathered, and the tools were three shekels to the tooth, and to the axe and the scythe there was the same rate." In their conjectural restoration of the original text according to the Greek, Then. and Böttch. proceed eclectically,* and translate: "And there happened sharpening of the edges to the shares and the spades at three shekels a tooth (that is, a single piece), and so for the axe and the sickle, yea, for the setting of the ox-goad" (Böttch. who differs from Then. as to the names of the implements, renders the second half: "and so for the sickles and the axes, and for the setting of the prong.") Against this (conjectural) fixing of the text are: first, the unintelligibleness and confusion of the Greek text, on which this emendation is founded; then, the obviously wrong conception of the Heb. by the Sept. in the beginning of ver. 21; further, the untenableness of the rendering "single piece" for ὀδόντα, שֵׁן [tooth], which is not supported (Then.) by Theodoret's remark "Symmachus renders *odonta* ploughshare, and Aquila plough," for this means merely that *odonta* was understood of this or that implement, not that it meant a single piece in reference to price; finally (Keil), "the then value of money," according to which "three shekels for sharpening an axe or a sickle would be an unheard-of price."—From this whole section it appears that, while the Philistines held the lowlands, the Hebrews carried on their tillage on the highlands and in the gorge of the Jordan.—In ver. 22 Sept. has "in the days" for "in the day," and after "battle" inserts "of Michmash," and so Then. and Ew.; but this is not necessary.† Referring to ver. 19 it is said: **There was neither sword nor spear found in the hand of any of the people** that were with Saul and Jonathan. In consequence of the above-mentioned measure of the Philistines, the entire force with Saul and Jonathan, 600 in number (to this force the phrase "all the people" is from the context to be referred) was unprovided with *arms*. This is not in contradiction with the narrative of the battle and victory of Israel over the Ammonites (chap. xi.); for there we have not a regular army, but a sudden rising of the people, and, even though arms were gotten by that victory, it does not thence follow that the comparatively small force that remained with Saul and Jonathan must have been regularly furnished with arms, inasmuch as the Philistine plan of disarming the Israelites was a permanent one, and necessarily resulted in a general lack of arms. These arms were found only with Saul and Jonathan.—Ver. 23. מַעֲבַר מ' is the passage or pass of Michmash. From Beeroth (Bireh) extends a deep valley, the present Wady es Suweinit, south-east and then east, opening into the valley towards Jericho. On the heights opposite lay southward Geba (Jeba) northward Michmash (Muchmas). Eastward from these camps of the Israelites and Philistines several side-Wadys opened into the deep Wady, partly from the north-west, partly from the south-west, by which the passage was formed. Comp. Rob. *Pal.*, II. 327 sq. [Am. ed., I. 440 sq.], and *Later Bibl. Researches*, 378 sq. [*Am. ed.*, III. 289 sq.]. "The ridges between these (the side-Wadys) terminate in elevated points projecting into the great Wady; and the easternmost of these bluffs on each side were probably the outposts of the two garrisons of Israel and the Philistines." *Towards* the pass of Michmash (north, therefore, over against the Israelites) the Philistines sent forward a post, a van-guard, as protection against the Israelites, who might else have slipped up unperceived through the side-Wadys or the pass formed by these, and surprised the Philistine camp. The strategical movement here indicated precisely accords with the ground where Robinson has pointed out the pass. It is hence unnecessary (with Ew. and Bunsen) to read מַעֲבָר and translate: "The van-guard of the Philistines was thrown forward beyond the camp of Michmash," though this in fact was done, since a force was thrown forward from the camp eastward towards the pass.

4. XIV. 1-15. *Jonathan's bold attack on the Philistines.*

Ver. 1. "On a day" (הַיּוֹם), on the *definite* day on which the following occurred. The words: And Jonathan said to his armor-bearer: **Let us go over to the Philistines' garrison,** are repeated in ver. 6 for the continuation of the narrative which they introduce. What lies between [vers. 2–5] is a statement of the existing special circumstances and local relations. This detailed narration shows that it is taken from the account of an eye-witness. The "*garrison*" of the Philistines is the advanced post mentioned in xiii. 23. **On the other side.***

The interjacent statements introduce us into the details of the whole situation: 1) *Jonathan says*

* Rejecting the הַבָּצִיר [vintage] of the Greek, and reading הַפְצִיר [sharpening], which they connect with הַפִּים [the edges], and instead of לִשְׁלֹשׁ קִלְּשׁוֹן [tridents] read בִּשְׁלֹשָׁה שְׁקָלִים לַשֵּׁן וְכֵן [at three shekels to the tooth, and so].

† On the form מִלְחֶמֶת see Ewald, *Grammar*, §188 *c*.

* הַלָּז is an abbreviation of הַלָּזֶה, the strengthened demonst. "*that*;" it is seldom found, as here, without preceding substantive. Comp. Dan. viii. 16; Ewald, §103 *d*.

nothing to his father of his purpose, because he would have forbidden it as too dangerous; the undertaking is set on foot secretly, in the hope of surprising the enemy in sleep or unprepared. 2) *Saul* (ver. 2) is encamped at the *extremity of Gibeah*. This is mentioned to show that Jonathan could unknown to him make such a blow. Gibeah (ver. 16) is the city Gibeah in Benjamin, whither also Samuel had gone from Gilgal (xiii. 15) back of Geba towards the south, yet with its extremity (ver. 16) not so far from the pass of the southward-trending Wady, that the movements in the ranks of the Philistines opposite could not be thence observed. **Under the pomegranate-tree which is in Migron.** By "*rimmon*" we must here understand not the name of a place, but, on account of the Art., the well-known pomegranate. According to Judg. xx. 45 a rock near Gibeah bore the name "Rock of the pomegranate" [Rimmon]; and was well adapted for a fortified position. It is a natural supposition that the same place is meant here, named after the well-known pomegranate. Luther here renders *Migron* incorrectly *suburb*. Linguistically it can only signify a place, which, however, from the local relations cannot be the *Migron* of Isa. x. 28, north of Michmash, whose name seems to be found in the ruins of Magrun, eight minutes from Beitin. *Rob.* II. 340 [see Am. ed. I., 463, Stanley's *Sin. and Pal.* 202]. Rather this place lay south of the pass of Michmash on the northern extremity of Gibeah-Benjamin (Saul), and was marked by the well-known pomegranate. From the context it appears that Gibeah-Benjamin* extended far along on the heights which stretched out (south of Geba) north-east towards the pass of Michmash, and ended in a rock on which the pomegranate stood, and on whose declivity lay the place Migron. The word means perhaps "*precipice*" (Then.) which is linguistically better than "threshing-floor" (Rosenm. *Alterth.* II., 2, 171). That two contiguous places should bear this name is, on account of the nature of the ground, as little surprising (Winer) as the frequent occurrence of the names Ramah and Gibeah (Geba).—3) *Saul's following* consisted of about six hundred men and *Ahiah* the high-priest. We must render: **And Ahiah—bare the ephod.**† The words "priest of Jehovah in Shiloh" belong not to *Ahiah* (Sept., Luth.), but to *Eli*. Wearing the ephod was a sign of the high-priestly office. Probably Ahiah was with Saul at Gilgal, and ministered in the offering there made by him. The name Ahiah ["Jehovah is brother" or "brother of Jehovah"] is identical with Ahimelech ["brother of the king"] under which this great-grandson of Eli, the sole survivor, (ii. 33) of the house of Eli, appears (xxi. 2; xxii. 9, 11, 20; xxx. 7, *e. a.*). As to whether of the two names was the original, Ewald remarks that they may have been used without much distinction (since *melech* "king" might refer to God) as in Elimelech (in Ruth) and Elijah (*Gesch.* II. 585, Rem. 3).—The people with Saul also knew nothing of Jonathan's purpose. This statement connects itself naturally with the remark on Saul's following.—4) Exact *description of the ground* which Jonathan had to traverse in his bold secret enterprise, vers. 4, 5. According to Robinson's remarks the plural "passes" is to be explained of the several passages which were made possible by the side-valleys. It is not probable that the plural refers to a *long* passage over the mountain (Then.). Further the word "between" is intelligible only on the supposition of several passes. Between these passes lay opposite one another two rocky crags or projections, formed by the side-wadys opening right and left into the deep, precipitous Wady es-Suweinit. Robinson went from Jeba (Geba) through that Wady across to Michmash. In this passage (from south to north) he had on the *left* two hills with steep rocky sides. "Behind each," says he, "runs up a smaller Wady, so as almost to isolate them. One is on the side towards Jeba and the other towards Mukhmas" (II. 329 [*Am. ed.* I. 441]). To this observation of Robinson answers exactly the description in ver. 5, according to which the one rock-ledge, Bozez, was a *column** on the north, the other Seneh, on the south, opposite Geba.

Ver. 6. Continuation of the narrative, with resumption of Jonathan's words to his armor-bearer [ver. 1], but with the difference that the Philistines are here not called by their own name, but "uncircumcised." This expression marks the difference between them and Israel as covenant-people, which forms the basis for the following utterance of Jonathan. Ewald's characterization of Jonathan's feeling as "a mixture of youthful impatience and lofty courage" (III. 48) does not fully explain the inner side of this deed. Its natural basis is youthful heroic spirit and impetuous desire of achievement; but it receives high ethical value and significance from its religious *root* in Jonathan's God-fearing and God-trusting heart, whose feeling is expressed in the word: **Perhaps Jehovah will work for us, for there is no restraint to Jehovah to save by many or by few.**—Over against the "uncircumcised" Jonathan is clearly conscious: 1) that his people is the chosen one, belonging to the Lord, with whom the Lord has made a covenant, and 2) that the Lord cannot deny His almighty help to this people as their covenant-God. This word of Jonathan expresses the genuine theocratic disposition of the liveliest consciousness of God and the firmest trust in God, whence alone could come a true deliverance of the people from their oppressive burden. The "perhaps" indicates not a doubt, but the humility which was coupled with Jonathan's heroic spirit; he is far from tempting God. The *humble* and *modest* hope which is expressed in the word: "perhaps the Lord will work for us" is straightway *grounded* on the truth: there is no *restraint* to the Lord, that is, he is at liberty to save by many or by few; that is, the Lord's help is not dependent on the extent or the degree of the means by which it is realized; his helping power is not conditioned, but absolute. The same thought in Ps. cxlvii. 10, 11; 2 Chron. xiv. 11; 1 Mac. iii. 18, 19.—Ver. 7. The answer of the

* [This might be true of the district of Gibeah, but not of the town itself, which occupied the summit of a high rounded hill; nor does it seem necessary to put Migron near Michmash; the statement in ver. 16 rather supposes a greater distance.—Tr.]

† [See "Textual and Grammatical" on this verse.—Tr.]

* מֻצּוּק, "poured out," from יָצַק, then "firm," "hard." [Better from צוּק.—Tr.]

armor-bearer contains: 1) encouragement to carry out his design, and 2) assurance that he will act with him and stand by him according to his will. Render: "do all whereto thy heart inclines."* — Ver. 8. Jonathan explains that, in carrying out his purpose, he proposes that they first *show* themselves to the Philistines. —In verses 9, 10, we are told how he would therein find a divine sign whether the Lord would grant unto them success in their design. He supposes *two cases*. If the Philistines at his hail should say: "*keep still! till we come to you*," they will not go up to them; for that would be a sign of courage and preparedness. But if they should say: "come up to us," they will go up; for that would be a sign of carelessness and slackness. This he would regard as a divine sign that God had given the Philistines into his hands. The divine sign, which Jonathan proposed to find, was a fact which guaranteed the success of the enterprise on its natural-human side also.—Ver. 11. When Jonathan and his esquire showed themselves, the latter of the two cases occurred. The outposts of the *Philistines* cry scornfully: **Hebrews are coming forth out of their holes**, and call out to them: **Come up to us, and we will tell you something.** An expression taken directly from the life of the people, containing an apparently bold challenge, yet (as we may see) not meant in earnest, and concealing cowardice or careless security and neglect. Cleric.: "They hoped to have sport with them, not supposing that they could there climb the rock." Jonathan is now sure *that God has given them into his hands*.† —Ver. 13. Lively description of the execution by Jonathan and his armor-bearer of their bold undertaking and the brilliant result. **On his hands and feet Jonathan** climbed up the rock, and **the armor-bearer** after him. The *text-reading:* "and they fell before Jonathan and his armor-bearer," *etc.*, gives a very good sense, as Then. expressly admits. We need not, then, after the Sept. read: "and they turned before Jonathan and he smote them," where Sept. incorrectly read וַיִּפְנוּ for וַיִּפְּלוּ. How (as Ewald asserts) the connection favors the reading of the Sept. is not to be seen.—**The armor-bearer slew completely after him.**—The Sept. has ἐπεδίδου, whence, however, we are not to read מוסיף ["more fully"] instead of the text "slaying;" the latter is to be retained from the connection, the narrative, from the rapidity of the affair, pressing on to describe how Jonathan, pushing on, strikes down with overwhelming might every one whom he meets, without stopping to kill *completely*, while the armor-bearer, following him, kills those that were struck down, that they might not rise again. The Heb. word (מְמוֹתֵת) means "killing *completely*," as in xvii. 51; 2 Sam. i. 9 sq.—A like bold deed in scaling a castle in the Numidian war is told in *Sall. Bell. Jugurth.*, c. 89, 90.—[This force of "complete killing" can hardly be assigned to this Heb. form (Polel, here causative of Qal, of מות). It means simply "kill," and so in the passages cited by the author, and the statement here seems to be that not only Jonathan, but also his armor-bearer (like the feudal esquire) took part in the combat. The phrase "fell before him" fairly means "fell dead;" the words do not warrant the history gotten out of them by Dr. Erdmann. But the Heb. text, though somewhat hard, may be maintained without this. See "Text. and Gramm."—Tr.]—Ver. 14. *The result of this* **first slaughter which Jonathan and his armor-bearer made: about thirty men** were thus killed. In the last words of the verse the overthrow is set forth in terms taken from ploughing: **in about a half-furrow of a yoke of land.**—This indicates the position of the fallen, after Jonathan, pressing impetuously on, had struck them down one after another, and his armor-bearer after him had killed those that were not dead. This occurred in the space of about half a furrow in a piece of land which one could plough with a yoke of oxen in a day.* In the length of about a half-yoke lay the twenty slain Philistines stretched out in a row. Cleric.: "Such apparently was the extent of the point of rock which the Philistines had occupied." Of the translation of the Sept.: "about twenty men with darts and slings and stones of the field," Clericus rightly says: "They translated conjecturally what they did not understand." To Ewald's rendering "as if a yoke of land were in ploughing" (so Bunsen, who regards this as an extract from a poet) there are, in the first place, two objections: 1) that the word (מנעה) means "furrow," and not "ploughing," and 2) that "yoke of land" means not the animals, but the land itself. Further objection to this rendering, especially in reference to the completed fact here related [Ewald represents it as an advancing act, while the first half of the verse speaks of it as

* The נְטֵה לָךְ is difficult, the rendering "turn thee," *i. e.*, "go," not being allowable. It is, therefore, better to read with Ewald לְבָבְךָ instead of כִּלְבָבְךָ, and נֹטֶה instead of נְטֵה, and render: "do all to which thy heart inclines." The words: "see, I am with thee according to thy heart," *i. e.*, as thy heart desires, present no difficulty, so that it is unnecessary, with Then. after Sept., to insert לְבָבִי after כִּלְבָבְךָ, and read: lo, I am with thee, *as thy mind* (is also) *my mind*. The Heb. text is more appropriate to the occasion from its curtness and pregnancy.

† At the beginning of ver. 12 we find the fem. form for "garrison" [מַצָּבָה] instead of the usual masc. (מַצָּב) On this Böttcher remarks: "The grammatical ground is that in ver. 12 it is said: the *people* (from several points) of the *whole* garrison cried out." The *whole* is properly expressed by the feminine form. See on Gen. xxxviii. 18.

* מַעֲנָה is the furrow which the plough makes, as in Ps. cxxix. 3. It is in stat. abs. instead of stat. const., because three nouns here stand together. Ew. § 291 *a*: "Sometimes the second noun of such a series seems to remain in stat. abs., so that we can only tell from the sense of the whole, the relation of the third to the two preceding. Isa. lxiii. 11; Eccl. xii. 13.—צֶמֶד properly "something bound," then "a pair or yoke of oxen," then "the ground ploughed by a yoke of oxen in a definite time," —*jugum, jugerum*.

finished.—Tr.], see in Thenius.—[The Sept. text may easily be gotten from the Heb., omitting the κ. ε. πετρ. as repetition (see Then. and Wellhausen), and gives a better sense. Bib. Com.: "There is nothing remarkable in twenty men being killed in half an acre of land; and moreover the Heb. sentence is extremely obscure, without any apparent reason for its being so. . . . A measure of time would not be out of place, if the words could mean 'in about half the time that a yoke of oxen draw a furrow in the field.'" Others, less well, understand here a space enclosed by a furrow. Philippson remarks that the ancients were accustomed to measure land by the ploughing of oxen; but the difficulty here is not in the way of stating the land-measure, but in understanding why it is stated. Kitto (*Daily Bib. Ill.*) gives a good narrative of the exploit of Jonathan. The text must be regarded as unsettled. —Tr.]—Ver. 15. The *consequence* of this bold deed: panic fear among the Philistines. The *success* of Jonathan's deed and this *consequence* are to be explained by supposing that the outposts of the Philistines did not think it possible that the two men could get up, and, when they did, feared that a body of Israelites were behind them, since they could not see down the steep declivity. **The camp of the field** [Heb.: in the camp (or host) in the field—Tr.] is the whole camp of the Philistines; the terror, which had seized *all the people of the outposts*, now took possession of the principal camp also. The *spoilers* also, the body of plunderers, *trembled*. There are many examples in military history of the contagious power of such fright, extending from a few widely out. **And the earth quaked** is not to be understood of an earthquake, but of the trembling of the ground under the fearful uproar of the Philistines.—**And became a terror of God.** The phrase "and became" refers to the before-described disaster of the Philistines, all this grew into a "terror of God," that is, the Philistines recognized herein a mighty help of the God of Israel, by which they had been thrown into this terror. [The natural rendering is "the earth quaked and became a terror of God," that is, the trembling earth became the sign of the wrathful intervention of God (comp. Vulg.); a miraculous earthquake seems to be here described. Others regard the divine name as a superlative addition, and render "a great (a panic) terror" (Gesen., *al.*) like "cedars of God" Ps. lxxx. 11, but this is not probable in this prose narrative.—Tr.]

5. Vers. 16-23. *General flight and overthrow of the Philistines in consequence of Jonathan's exploit.*—Ver. 16. Gibeah of Benjamin is not the present Jeba (Then.), which rather answers to *Geba*. Though the former was farther from the Philistine camp, we need not be surprised that Saul's watchmen could see thither, since from their elevated position they could with sharp eyes see what was going on at that distance (nearly five Eng. miles), or, if not, could go nearer.—**And behold, the multitude** or **the tumult**—though הָמוֹן may here mean "multitude" (Gesen. *s. v.*), it is better to render "*tumult*," since the narrator has in his eye the crowd thrown into confusion by Jonathan's attack. This consideration sets aside one of Thenius' reasons for here also following the free translation of the Sept.;—**dispersed hither and thither.** It is better to supply "hither" (הֲלֹם before וַהֲלֹם), which might easily have fallen out from homœophony; or (with the *Rabb.* and Ges.) read the Inf. Abs. and render "were more and more broken up." [For another view see "Text. and Grammat."—Tr.] Ver. 17. Saul could explain the affair only as an Israelitish attack. The *numbering* ordered by him showed that Jonathan and his armor-bearer were missing.—Ver. 18. **Bring hither the ark of God.** A change of text (Keil) after the Sept. so as to read: "Bring the ephod, for he wore the ephod at that time before Israel," on the ground that the ark had been placed in Kirjath-jearim, and was not used in asking questions of God, is suspicious, because the ark, which was thought to be connected with God's presence, was often taken along to war. Comp. iv. 4, 5; 2 Sam. xi. 11; xv. 24, 25. Why could they not, in accordance with this established custom, have taken it from its usual place in decisive battles, and afterwards carried it back? But it is not said that Saul wished to *inquire* of God *at the ark*. He wished first to advance *with it* against the enemy. But, when he saw that the tumult increased in their camp, and that they were already as good as beaten, he desisted.* [If Saul had not wished to inquire of God by the ark, he would not have said "bring hither," (but "carry forward"), nor "withdraw thy hand." It seems better, therefore, to read *ephod*, whether we adopt the whole reading of the Sept. or not.—Tr.]—Ver. 19. **And the tumult . . . . and it increased more and more** is a broken construction, the subject being first put absolutely, and the predicate-sentence put as relative-sentence. *Withdraw thy hand;* that is, from bringing the ark = desist. Instead (ver. 20) of "were assembled, called together" (Niph.), read with Sept. (Alex.), Vulg., Syr., Arab.; "shouted" (Qal), for there was no need of an assembly, as they were already there (Then.), and besides, what is the meaning of "*and Saul* was called together and all the people," since Saul was the assembler? Translate: **And Saul and all the people shouted (raised the war-cry) and advanced to the battle.** From this *war-cry* of the advancing host under Saul that which follows is easily explained. In consequence of the *terror* thereby produced, the *confusion* in the Philistine army was *very great*. That *every man's sword was against his fellow* in such confusion (comp. Judg. vii. 22; 2 Chron. xx. 22, 23) is explained by what is related in vers. 21, 22. There were *Hebrews* in the host of the Philistines. By this name, the usual one among foreign nations, the Philistines called the Israelites in their midst. The Art. (*the* Hebrews) refers to the exacter definition in the relative sentence. **And the Hebrews were with the Philistines, as formerly, who had gone up with them to the camp.** [It is better to insert who (אשׁר) after "Hebrews," as in Eng. A. V.—Tr.]. Bunsen supposes that these were prisoners, who had hitherto been compelled to fight against their countrymen. Or, they may have been levies from the part of the land which

* [For וּבְנֵי י׳ which gives no sense, read לִבְנֵי י׳.

the Philistines held. To render "divided out *roundabout* among the Philistines" gives no good sense; the idea of "*roundabout*" is inappropriate to the whole situation. It is therefore better to read,* with Sept., Vulg., Chald., Syr., Thenius, Buns., "turned." The otherwise insuperable difficulty in the Infin. thus vanishes, and we render: "these also turned *to be* with Israel;" that is, went over to Israel. This, of course, they could not do without turning their arms against their oppressors. In addition to these (ver. 22) came all the Israelites who had been in hiding on the mountains of Ephraim; when they heard of the flight of the Philistines, they too joined in the pursuit.—Ver. 23 1) affirms that this fortunate achievement was due to *the help of the Lord*, and 2) states the direction which the battle took. **The battle passed over to Bethaven.** Between this statement that the fight moved northeast† from Michmash to Bethaven, and that in ver. 31, that the Philistines were smitten that day from Michmash to Ajalon [west], an insoluble contradiction† has been discovered, and it has been proposed to read Bethhoron (which lay west of Michmash) instead of Bethaven. But such a contradiction cannot be admitted, because the movements in such a battle are so fluctuating. Here in ver. 23 we have an account of the *battle which continued*, and passed, not far from Michmash indeed, over to Bethaven in a northeasterly direction; in ver. 31 is an account of the completed battle, and the final result is given, which is naturally this, that the Philistines, drawn by the Israelites from their native land towards Bethaven, fled, the greater part of them at least, westward, and were beaten as far as Ajalon. Bunsen: "In general the flight of the Philistines was naturally westward (ver. 31), yet no exception can on that account be taken to our passage."

6. Vers. 24-31. *Saul's rash order.* Between ver. 23 and ver. 24 the Sept. has: "And the whole people was with Saul about ten thousand men, and the battle spread in the whole city in the mountains of Ephraim. And Saul committed a great error" (that day and adjured). This is an explanatory addition to the original text with whose curtness it does not harmonize. It is not in itself improbable that the original six hundred men should grow to this large body in the course of the battle, and that the fight should extend over the mountains of Ephraim is to be expected from the dispersed condition of the Philistines, and is even indicated in the end of ver. 23. The phrase "in the whole city" has arisen from a misreading of the following word "*wood*" (בַּיַּעַר).—The Masoretic text is short, sharp, and to the point, corresponding to Saul's position and conduct as here described.—**And the men of Israel were distressed that day.** In chap. xiii. 6 the same word (נִגַּשׂ) is used to express the oppressed condition of the Israelites. Here it is Saul that presses and drives the people in the pursuit of the Philistines. The word means "harassed, wearied out," and Thenius' objection that one does not see by whom or by what the Israelites were pressed, explains itself.—The wearied condition of the people made Saul fear that the pursuit of the Philistines would thereby be interrupted, and the honor of the day for him diminished. **And Saul adjured the people.***—He made them swear an oath—bound them by an oath. **Cursed be the man that eateth food until evening and I be avenged on my enemies.**—Saul's passionate zeal, spurred on by selfishness, self-will and personal *desire for revenge* causes him to lose sight of the command of nature, to act cruelly towards his brave warriors, and over and beyond to injure his cause. "Blind zeal only hurts." *Berlenb. Bible:* "In this prohibition there was a secret pride and misuse of power, for he desired to force, as it were, a complete victory, and then appropriate the glory of it to himself." The people kept the oath even under the strongest temptation to break it.—Ver. 25. **And the whole land came into the wood.**—The "land" is put for the *people*, as appears from ver. 26. Comp. Jer. xxii. 29. The *honey* which they found in the forest on the ground *flowing* (הֵלֶךְ דְּבַשׁ) was not that honey-like substance which is found on the leaves of certain bushes and taken off them, but real honey from bees who built on trunks of trees or in clefts of rocks, which, as Schultz (*Leistungen*, V. 133) has seen in the wilderness of Judea, often flows in streams on the ground from the over-full and pressed honey structure (comp. Deut. xxxii. 13; Judg. xiv. 8; Ps. lxxxi. 17).—Ver. 26. On account of the oath no one partook of the refreshing food which thus presented itself.—Ver. 27. Jonathan, however, had not heard the oath of his father. He dips his *staff* into the honey and eats, in accordance with the *haste* of the pursuit—that is, into the honey-comb (Sept.: κηρίον; Vulg.: *favum*, the comb, not the liquid honey), which presented itself; into the *comb*, not the liquid honey, because only in this way could he get enough with the tip of his staff. Instead of "saw" (Kethib) read "*were enlightened*" (Qeri); see a similar transposition in Heb. in 2 Sam. xxiv. 20, comp. v. 16. The word describes the bodily and mental refreshment, the reviving of soul, which shows itself straightway in the eyes.—Ver. 28. The last words: "*And the people are faint*" are spoken by the man who tells Jonathan of the oath of his father, and at the same time stand in contrast with the refreshment which Jonathan had indulged himself in.—Ver. 29 sq. Jonathan's disapproval of his father's conduct by pointing to the injury he has thus done the land and people: "My father has troubled (עָכַר, *perturbare*), brought disaster on the land" (Genesis xxxiv. 30; Josh. vi. 18; Judg. iv. 35). The disaster is this: that the people, wearied with the battle, had lost all strength by the lack of nourishing food (אָכֹל אָכַל). The defeat of the Philistines was thus less complete than it would

* [סָבְבוּ גַם ... לִהְיוֹת.—Tr.]

† [According to xiii. 5, Bethaven was northwest from Michmash, and there is therefore no contradiction here.—Tr.]

* Read not וַיּוֹאֶל as if from הוֹאִיל, "acted foolishly," but וַיֹּאֶל Impf. Apoc. for וַיְּאַלֶּה, from אָלָה, Ges. *Gr.* § 76, 2 *a*.

otherwise have been (ver. 29).* Maurer renders as independent sentence: "for now the slaughter of the Philistines is not very great."—Ver. 31. See on ver. 23. *Ajalon*, the present village Yâlo, in the south-east end of a valley extending westward from Bethhoron. Rob. *Later Bib. Res.* 188 [Am. ed. III. 145—and II. 253, 254; 14 miles out of Jerusalem, Smith's *B. D.*—Tr.] The mention of the great *weariness* and exhaustion of the people concludes the account of Saul's rash conduct, and leads to the statement of its consequences.

7. Vers. 32–46. *The consequences of Saul's over-haste, and the end of the battle.*—Ver. 32.† **And the people flew upon the prey**—that is, as soon as it was evening, comp. ver. 24. The same expression in xv. 19. The people slew the animals *to the earth, down to the ground*, and then ate "*upon* (or, *over*) *the blood*," blood being on the bodies because they were on the ground, and so "with the blood." On the preposition (עַל) see Ex. xii. 8 [Eng. A. V.: "with"], where also it introduces the basis or accompaniments of the food. The people transgressed the command in Lev. xix. 26: "Ye shall not eat *on blood*" [Eng. A. V.: "with"], that is, no flesh under which or on which there is blood. This is an extension of the prohibition of eating blood in Lev. iii. 17; xvii. 10, 11, which is based on the fact that the blood is conceived of as the seat and bearer of the life.—Ver. 33. The people's eating is characterized as a *sinning* against the Lord.‡ Saul calls this conduct *faithlessness*, because the law of the covenant was transgressed. For *now* the Sept. has (unnecessarily) *hither*. [The הַיּוֹם, "to-day," "this day," is here not well rendered by "now," which would be עַתָּה; the Sept. reading is better. —Tr.]—Ver. 34. Saul directs his informants to *disperse themselves among the people*, and announce that every one should bring his beast to him, and slay *here* on the *great stone*, that there might be no sinful eating.§ Saul's command, which speaks for his careful observance of the Law, was carried out by the people. As every where before, so here the people display unconditional obedience to Saul. Only by slaughtering on the stone was it possible to separate the blood from the flesh. When the slaughtering occurred, the *night* had already set in. The Sept. reading: "what was in his hand" instead of "his ox in his hand" [Eng. A. V.: "with him"] is unnecessary.—Ver. 35. Saul built *the altar* to the Lord as *thanksgiving* for this victory over the Philistines. **The same he began to build**—that is, he built this as the first, comp. Gesen. § 142, A. 1. [*Bib. Comm.*: "began to build, but did not finish," as 1 Chr. xxvii. 24. So Abarbanel; but, according to the Midrash, Saul began among the kings the building of altars (Philippson). Wordsworth: It seems to be implied that this was the first time he had made acknowledgment to God for his successes.—Tr.] Probably he here used the great stone which he had caused to be brought. He thus established a place for the worship of God in commemoration of this victory.—Ver. 36. He is, however, not satisfied with the defeat of the Philistines, but proposes to spoil them that night till the *morning*. According to Jonathan's statement, indeed, the defeat was not total. Saul rushes on in his wild desire of revenge, perhaps incited by the consciousness of having committed a gross folly, and thereby hindered the victory—and this he will now make good. The *people* are again ready immediately to carry out his desire. The priest, however, desires first to have the decision of the Lord. "Hither," that is, to the altar which had been built. [Patrick: because it was dangerous to undertake any thing without God's advice. *Bib. Comm.*: because the priest doubted whether Saul's ardor was a righteous one, and bravely stood in its way.—Tr.]—Ver. 37. The *inquiry of the Lord* was conducted by the high-priest Ahiah through the Urim and Thummim.* The Lord shall say whether the Philistines are to be pursued, and whether He has delivered them into Israel's hands. There are therefore two questions: whether further pursuit? whether happy result? *The failure of a divine answer* is for Saul a sign that there is a fault somewhere, on account of which the Lord is silent and does not promise His help.—Ver. 38. *Chief* (פִּנָּה "corner," "point"), the principal men, the heads of the people (Judg. xx. 2), probably the elders (Num. xi. 30). The whole people are called by their representatives, to find out "*wherein* (or *whereby*) *this sin hath been this day*." There is no need to read (with Then. after Vulg.: *per quem*—and Sept.: ἐν τίνι) "on whom (בְּמִי) this sin rests," instead of "wherein" (בַּמָּה). Rather the *thing* than the person was here first to be regarded, since the question was of an offence unatoned for,—which, however, indeed, could not be fixed without at the same time discovering the person.—Ver. 39. After the first כִּי [here="because," "for"], which gives the ground, follows a second and a third, the former introducing the declaration, the latter resuming it after the parenthesis. The silence of the people is (as appears from ver. 45) sign of their conviction that Jonathan had done nothing wrong. [Perhaps, also, sign of their regard for Jonathan. It does not seem that Saul was here guilty of profanity (*Bib. Comm.*), since he may have used the divine name reverently (the expression was very common among the Israelites), but he is guilty (*Bib. Comm.*) of further rashness.—Tr.]—Ver. 40. Saul proceeds to decide what was the offence which prevented the divine answer. The means which Saul here employs

* אַף כִּי, properly "*thereto comes that*," then "*let alone*," "*not to mention*," and after an affirmation "*all the more*," "*how much more*," 2 Sam. iv. 11; Gen. § 155, 2 *a*. כִּי עַתָּה often serves to introduce more strongly the apodosis of a conditional sentence: "*yea, then*." Ew. § 358, 2 *a*; Gen. xxxi. 42; xliii. 10; Num. xxii. 29; 2 Sam. ii. 27. The לֹא indicates that the apodosis is a question.

† For the meaningless וַיַּעַשׂ read וַיַּעַט, Imperf. Qal. of עִיט with *Dag. forte implicit.* instead of וַיָּעַט, Ges. § 72, *R. g*. So after שָׁלָל insert Art. with Qeri.

‡ חֹטְאִים for חֹטְּאִים with retracted vowel. Ew. § 188 *c*.

§ אֶל־הַדָּם "to the blood." The change of Prep. does not alter the meaning; אֶל stands for עַל as in Judg. vi. 39 (see Maur. *in loc.*), 2 Sam. i. 24; x. 7—both sometimes occurring in the same sentence, as xxv. 25; xxvi. 15 sqq.; 2 Sam. ii. 9; xx. 23.

* [That is, by the Ephod, to which was attached the breastplate with U. and T.—Tr.]

reminds us of how Samuel (x. 20, 21) by the *lot* as means of divine decision presented Saul to the people as the king chosen by the Lord. While in the great double question in ver. 37 Saul had applied to the Lord by Urim and Thummim, and by His *silence* received also an *answer*, and that a decisive one, he now, in order to discover the cause of this divine decision, employs the lot, as is clear from the words "taken" [ver. 41] and "cast" [ver. 42] (comp. x. 20 sq.), which are never used in connection with Urim and Thummim. The *people*, who had not answered him when he swore a second rash oath in which he recognized the possibility of Jonathan's guilt and death, now expressly approved his arrangements, but silently decided for Jonathan's innocence and exemption from punishment. *Saul* (ver. 41) before the casting turns to God with the cry "give (or establish) right." תָּמִים, "unpunishable," then "exemption from punishment," "innocence," "right," "truth." So Judg. ix. 16, 19; Josh. xxiv. 14. The result of the trial is that Jonathan is taken, ver. 42.—The Vulgate agrees with the Heb. in ver. 41 only in the beginning and end: "and Saul said to the Lord God of Israel—and Jonathan and Saul were taken, but the people went out." The intermediate words agree in part with the Sept., which in vers. 41, 42, has a long paraphrase. In this Then. and Ew. see a part of the original text, reading תֻּמִּים [Thummim] for תָּמִים, and finding here the complete formula which was employed in the use of Urim and Thummim. Against which Keil justly remarks, that there is no sign here of the use of Urim and Thummim, since the words in ver. 41 are provably never used of it, but always of the lot, and it is clear from passages like x. 22 and 2 Sam. v. 23 that Urim and Thummim did not consist merely in answering Yes and No, but God by it gave answers, which could by no means be gotten by the lot. The Sept. reading is, therefore, nothing but a subjective and erroneous opinion of the translators.

Ver. 43 sq. *Jonathan* thinks death unavoidable: **Lo, I must die.**—*Saul* confirms this with an oath: "God do so and more also," comp. iii. 17. *Both* hold the erroneous opinion that a sinful promise or oath must be kept. That the lot fell on Jonathan meant only, as a divine disposition, that the person was discovered on whom, according to Saul's opinion, rested the fault, by reason of which God's answer to his question was silence. Against both rises the *people's voice* as the voice of God. The question [ver. 45] "Shall Jonathan die?" and the answer: "Far be it," express the sorrowful astonishment and the energetic protest of the people who were inspired by Jonathan's heroic deed and its brilliant result. But the decisive fact for the people was the firm conviction that God was with him and carried out through him this deed of deliverance. Over against Saul's oath the people set their own: "As the Lord liveth, there shall not a hair of his head fall to the ground." To the second "wrought" (ver. 45) supply the object of the first: "this great salvation." "And the people rescued him," not, as Ewald says, by putting another to die in his stead, but solely by their energetic protest, in the face of which Saul is obliged to let his oath go unfulfilled. For a similar intervention of the people see Liv. 8, 35.—[Patrick: They did not rescue him by force and violence, but by their petition to Saul and the reason they gave for it. Josephus saith that "by their prayers and vows to God they delivered him." They were too forward indeed to swear directly against Saul's oath; but of the two, his being the most rash, God was pleased to annul it, and absolve him from it.—Wordworth: Observe the humiliation to which Saul is reduced by his disobedience. —Kitto: The enlightened consciences and generous enthusiasm of the people.—Tr.]—Ver. 46. The closing statement. *Saul* desisted from further pursuit of the Philistines, with whose overthrow as far as it could be effected under the harmful consequences of his blind zeal, he had to be contented. The *Philistines* went back to their own land. In spite of this serious defeat their strength was not broken (comp. ver. 52). The fact that Saul desisted from pursuit shows that he understood the Lord's silence as a denial, and was obliged to recognize as the cause of it not Jonathan's conduct, but his own arbitrary and rash procedure.

II. *Summary account of Saul's wars and family-relations.* Vers. 47–52.

Vers. 47, 48. **And Saul had taken the kingdom,** then he fought, or: "When Saul had taken the kingdom, he fought." The words do not stand in pragmatical connection with the preceding narrative of the battle against the Philistines, as if the intention was to state that *thus* (by this victory) Saul gained royal authority (Then., Keil). His accession to the throne is mentioned merely as starting-point for the historical-statistical statement of the various wars which he carried on from the beginning of his government. The already-related war against the Ammonites is here again mentioned, and of the war against the Philistines it is said, in accordance with the design of this interposed section, at the end (ver. 52), that it extended throughout his whole reign. His whole government was a warlike one. Wars are here mentioned, of which nothing is elsewhere said. What is said of his wars before and after this is determined by the theocratic point of view, and is designed to show how Saul, in fulfilling his royal calling (essentially a warlike one), came into principial* conflict with the theocratic task and significance of the kingdom, and therefore incurred of necessity the judgment of God. The wars, which he had to carry on with his enemies roundabout, are the following: against the *Moabites* and *Ammonites* in the *East*, against the *Edomites* in the *South*, against the kings of *Zobah* in the *Northeast* (*Zobah*, a district of Syria, lay probably north-east of Damascus, between the Euphrates and the Orontes, see 2 Sam. viii. 3 ["perhaps included the eastern flank of the mountain-chain which shuts in Cœle-Syria on that side, the high land about Aleppo, and the more northern portion of the Syrian desert" (Geo. Rawlinson in Smith *B. D.*).—Tr.]), and against the *Philistines* in the *West*. Thus the "roundabout" is pictured to us. The word

* [*Principial* (Germ. *prinzipiell*) is "founded on, or connected with principles," in contrast with what is accidental, inadvertent, not fundamental.—Tr.]

יַרְשִׁיעַ [Eng. A. V. "vexed"*] indicates the point of view from which these wars are to be regarded as victories: he declared guilty (Keil: by deeds), the Hiph. [causative] of the verb being often used of judges (Ex. xxii. 8; Deut. xxv. 1; Job xxxii. 3), *he inflicted punishment*, or executed *judgment* against these nations, because they warred against *God's people* and thus opposed the Lord's designs with respect to Israel. They were national wars, which Saul carried on for the honor of the Lord and of His people.—Saul's development of power against the Amalekites is made specially prominent; he "gathered strength"

[וַיַּעַשׂ חַיִל, Eng. A. V. incorrectly: "gathered a host"]. This war against the robbing, plundering hereditary enemy, the Amalekites, is in the next chapter described "from the theocratical point of view" (Then.).

Vers. 49–51. Saul's household and family. *Three sons* are mentioned: Jonathan, Ishwi and Malchishua. Instead of Ishwi in xxxi. 2; 1 Chron. viii. 33; ix. 39, is Abinadab. In the last two passages a *fourth* is named, Eshbaal,† who is certainly the same with Ishbosheth, 2 Sam. ii. 8. The *daughters: Merab* and *Michal*.—Saul's *wife: Ahinoam*, a daughter of *Ahimaaz*.—[*Bib. Comm.*: "It is not improbable that Ahimaaz may have been of the priestly family (Ahimaaz was son of Zadok, 2 Sam. xv. 36), and perhaps it may have been owing to such a connection that Ahijah was brought into prominence by Saul. If there is any truth in the above supposition, it would be an indication that Saul was not married till after his election to the throne." But to this last there are serious objections, especially the age of Jonathan, and the whole is a mere conjecture.—Tr.]—Saul's captain of the host, general-in-chief, *Abiner*, abbreviated (ver. 51) *Abner*, his *cousin;* in the next verse this relationship is stated more fully: Kish, Saul's father, and Neri, Abner's father, were sons of Abiel.‡—Ver. 52 connects itself as to subject-matter with ver. 46, in order, after the general view of Saul's wars, to show that he had to carry on a hard struggle with one of these peoples, the Philistines, all his life, and so give the ground for the necessity that Saul was under, of forming and maintaining a *central body* of markedly valiant men about him. This finishes the *historical-statistical* sketch of Saul as a *warrior-prince*, to which belongs also from this point of view the mention of his *three sons*, who fell in *battle* with him (xxxi. 2), and of *Abner*, his general. The *national-historical* significance of Saul as a king whose mission was essentially that of a *warrior* is thereby definitely characterized. At the same time the description of Saul as *theocratic* king is here ended. In what follows is shown how the Lord transferred the theocratic mission from him to another man. Ewald: According to the prophetical perception of the Work, Saul ceases with chap. xiv. to be the true king, and therefore the history of his reign is here concluded with the necessary general remarks about him."—We cannot (with Then.) hold that the remark (ver. 52) "when Saul saw any strong or valiant man, he took him," is intended to introduce the narrative of David's coming to Saul after the victory over Goliath (xviii. 2), on the ground that here it drags too much after what precedes. It would, if we accepted Thenius' view, stand too *abruptly* and *too far from* this narrative of David. It rather concludes the foregoing account, and connects itself with the account of the first formation of a standing army by a levy from the people (xiii. 2).

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The history of Saul up to this time shows with what splendid gifts he was endowed for the fulfilment of his theocratic royal calling, to free from their enemies, especially the Philistines (ix. 16), the covenant-people, who had been united and raised into a new religious-moral life by Samuel. The following narrative of his victorious wars against the enemies of God's people proves that he fulfilled his war-mission. "A knightly king stood at the head of the people, who formed about him a school of heroes and drew to him a vigorous army, and a knightly spirit pervaded the whole people. But Saul led the way in warlike spirit no less than in all virtues of self-denial and self-discipline,—he was a warrior-hero, who maintained on the throne the moderation of his former life." (Schlier., 25 [*König Saul*, 9]).

2. Yet there shows itself in the development of Saul's inner life (xiii., xiv) a principle, which is directly in conflict with the theocratic principle of the Israelitish kingdom: that of human self-will, which does not subject itself in humility and unconditional believing obedience to the divine will, and fails to establish the absolute supremacy of the latter among the people of God. At the beginning of the fulfilment of his warrior-calling against the Philistines Saul was put to the proof, whether in his royal office he would master his own will and yield unconditional obedience to the word and will of God as true king of His people. This test Saul did not stand, when he was required to follow the divine directions as given him by Samuel's mouth, which should have been for him God's mouth. As bearer of the theocratic-royal office bestowed on him, he set himself in conflict with the theocratic-prophetic watch-office, which Samuel held that he might be the organ of the royal will and command of the covenant-God of Israel. He thus denied the principle of the unconditional sovereignty of God, which was to be set forth and unfolded in his kingdom. It was therefore certain that God's holiness and justice could not permit his kingdom to be permanent (xiii. 13, 14).

3. The *first test of faith*, which Saul had to submit to, was *a theocratic necessity;* for Saul must first prove to the Lord by deeds that he wished to be unconditionally subject to the Lord's will, to yield obedience (putting down all self-will) to His word which was to be revealed to him by prophets, and to trust alone to His help. Such tests as Saul had to stand, are, in the life of princes and peoples, as of individuals, in the church as in every member of God's people, *of divine significance;* failure to stand them leads away from

* [So Philippson (*schreckte er*), taking the rad. meaning of the verb to be "to be unquiet." Ges. renders: "to pronounce guilty, gain one's cause, be victorious."—Tr.]

† [On the relation of Eshbaal, Ishbosheth and Ishwi, and the text in ver. 51, see "Text. and Gram." *in loco*.—Tr.]

‡ [So ver. 51 must be rendered instead of as in Eng. A. V.—Tr.]

the Lord, brings to naught the Lord's purposes, results in misfortune and destruction. *The individual elements* of Saul's probation, the typical significance of which elements for all times and circumstances of the kingdom of God is obvious, are found partly in his outward position, partly in his inner life. The *external position* of Saul, as to time and place, was one of extreme *distress*. In consequence of Jonathan's successful *coup de main*, the Philistines were advancing with a powerful army. The people of Israel, whom he had summoned after Jonathan's heroic exploit (xiii. 3) to battle against the Philistines, became disheartened and despondent, and dispersed themselves; even the permanent band, which he had gathered around him, lost courage and began to disband. The seventh day had come, and Samuel, who had bidden him wait till he came to Gilgal to sacrifice for the people and announce God's will, had not yet made his appearance. This distressing and dangerous position (as he himself xiii. 11, 12 intimates) gave occasion in *his heart* to the *temptation* to act contrary to God's will and command. In the first place *fear* of the threatening dangers seized on his heart; to fear joined itself *impatience*, which prevented him from waiting out the time appointed by Samuel; alongside of the impatience was *doubt* of the trustworthiness of the divine promise given him through Samuel; this produced *unquiet* in his mind, which drove him to take self-willed measures to help himself, and dissipated more and more his trust in God; then came *sophistical calculation* by his carnally obscured understanding; his heart-frame towards God of immovable *trust* and unconditional *obedience* was given up. It was the root of *unbelief* from which all this sprang.—*The consequences* of this unstood trial of faith show themselves straightway in two directions: 1) for Saul's *inner life:* over against Samuel, or, what is the same thing, over against the holy and just God (who had addressed Himself to his conscience through Samuel's question "what hast thou done?") he does not follow the exhortation of his conscience, sorrowfully and penitently to confess his guilt, but, on the one hand, he seeks to excuse and justify himself by pointing to the certainly threatening dangers, as if he had done nothing but his duty, carrying his defence to the extent of an untrue reproach of Samuel ("thou camest not at the set time"), and, on the other hand, he declares his conduct to be thoroughly pious and God-fearing, affirming that he desired simply before the battle began to seek in sacrifice the Lord's face, while in fact this sacrifice against Samuel's express command had its deepest root in the *unbelief* of his heart, wherein he turned from God to his own flesh and blood, and showed himself openly disobedient to the will of God. The self-justification of the impenitent heart leads to unclearness and untruthfulness, since lies and truth are mixed together; *self-justification* before the Lord is inseparable from self-deceit and hypocrisy. Here begins the *unsteadiness* and *passionate character* of Saul's inner life, as we see it afterwards (chap. xiv.) time and again, in all the external success of his arms, in all the prosperity of his warlike enterprises. 2) In respect to his *theocratic royal calling* followed the divine *judgment:* "Thy kingdom shall not stand, for thou hast not kept the command of the Lord." The house of Saul, which otherwise would have held the theocratic kingdom permanently, is here declared to have lost it, because Saul had not fulfilled the fundamental condition of unconditional obedience of faith. The judicial sentence is more fully expressed after the second trial (chap. xv.). There the divine judgment proceeds further to reject his person in consequence of continued disobedience; here we have first the rejection of his house, so far as, beginning from him, it might have become the permanent possessor of the theocratic royalty. The divine judgment, which is completed by this word of Samuel, was a righteous one, for "in this way Saul strove, so far as in him lay, to change the Israelitish theocracy (in which God would be King of Israel and by His servants, the prophets, rule in affairs of state and war) into such a kingdom as the heathen had, whose kings did everything according to their own pleasure. Saul strove after unrestrained freedom and authority, but thus became a slave to desire, driven by an evil spirit, and ripe for speedy destruction" (Roos, *Einl. in d. bibl. Gesch.* [Introd. to Bib. Hist.], 2, 271).

4. Jonathan's second bold deed of arms (xiv. 1–15) is, in contrast with Saul's failure to stand the trial of faith, an example of *victorious heroic faith*, which consists in unconditional but humble reliance on the almighty help of the Lord ("perhaps *the Lord* will, *etc.*," ver. 6), does not, in this confident reliance, fearfully weigh and reckon the much or little of *human* means of accomplishment ("there is no restraint to the Lord, *etc.*," ver. 6), but yet wisely and prudently observes the signs given by the Lord, governs its conduct by them, and then in God's power performs great things ("there came a fright of God," ver. 15).

5. Saul's conduct after his fall in the first probation of faith is an illustration of the fact that, when man's *heart* has lost its right attitude towards the Lord, his whole life, both in its *religious* and its *moral* aspect, loses truth and steadfastness. In accordance with the pretext (xiii. 12) that he must seek the Lord's face before the battle, Saul afterwards heaps up proofs of piety and godliness: he calls for the ark of God [or, the ephod—Tr.] (ver. 18), is zealous against the transgression of the prohibition of eating blood (ver. 33 sq.), builds an altar to the Lord (ver. 35), asks counsel of God as to further military undertakings (ver. 37), swears by the Lord, the Deliverer of Israel, to punish the concealed sin of the people (ver. 39), and calls on him to decide where the wrong is (ver. 41). When the *heart* has lost its proper attitude towards God of humble obedient faith, and will not return to God in honest penitence, there springs up the *delusion* that one may satisfy God and one's own conscience by *pious deeds*. The spur of an evil conscience drives us to the hypocrisy of a forced piety and of legal zeal for the honor of the Lord, while we put our own honor in the place of His. It is characteristic that, after that scene with Samuel, whose words did not bend and break his heart into honest repentance, Saul loses all *moral steadfastness*. By God's help the victory over the Philistines is gained (ver. 23), the enemy's whole army is routed and fleeing. Saul, instead of

thanking the Lord and granting his tired-out people some refreshment, is inflamed with fleshly zeal, which shows itself (ver. 24) in his purpose straightway to annihilate the enemy, and his consequent adjuration of his army not to eat anything till evening. In the thoughtlessness and precipitancy of his warlike ardor, he speaks the traitorous word "till *I* have avenged myself on *my* enemies," showing that he puts himself in the Lord's place, and forgets that the question was of the Lord's honor against *His* enemies and His people's. Saul is zealous for his own honor, for *his* right and *his* glory. It is this that makes him blind, so that he wishes to destroy the enemy till evening with people exhausted by a hot contest, without granting them rest and refreshment, cruelly and despotically ignoring natural human rights and needs, and, in addition, enforces his command by an oath. Such thoughtless and overhasty conduct could, as Jonathan distinctly says (ver. 29), only bring destruction. Saul's people, harassed by his blind ardor, could not do what they ought. The defeat of the Philistines was not as great as it would have been if rest and refreshment had been allowed (ver. 30). The strength of the people was broken (ver. 31). From the sinful root of Saul's fleshly ardor comes one evil fruit after another. The famished people, in consequence of his prohibition, rush ravenously on the animals, do not take time to separate blood from flesh, eat the flesh in its blood, and thus transgress the Lord's command. In the night Saul wishes to pursue the Philistines farther, in order to destroy them completely. But God checks him in this through the high-priest. So little does he recognize the fact that he is to blame for the incompleteness of the victory, that he wishes to slay Jonathan, who is wholly free from blame, for his unconscious transgression of his arbitrary and unjustifiable prohibition. The name of the Lord is invoked by Saul more than is necessary, and misused to cover his perverse disposition of heart. In overhaste and blind zeal he swears an oath, which, though convinced of its hostile operation, he *wishes* to keep, but *cannot* and is *not allowed* to keep. So it goes from sin to sin after humble faith in the Lord is once given up; in spite of all religious zeal and zeal for duty and calling, by which it is hoped to win God's approbation and heal the wound of a bad conscience, there remains the inner discord, and, if there come no true repentance and conversion, a condition of inner life must result like Saul's when the Spirit of the Lord left him and the evil spirit came over him.

6. There is here (vers. 24–26) a six-fold testimony against Saul: 1) The word of his own mouth: "till I have avenged myself on my enemies," ver. 24; 2) The word of his son: "my father troubles the land," ver. 29; 3) The failure of the pursuit of the Philistines, vers. 30, 31; 4) the Lord's silence when he was inquired of, ver. 37; 5) The silence of the people at his oath, ver. 39; 6) the decision of the people, ver. 45, by which God's decision was made apparent, and Saul's conflict with the Lord and himself shown to be a conflict also with the people, who recognized God's hand and will better than he. On God's side there are not lacking co-working means by which man, when he detaches himself from God, may be brought to consider himself and return to God. And if he do not return, it is because of the energy with which the human will persistently follows its own path, and rejects all God's exhortations and influences.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Chap. xiii. 1–15. *The test to which faith is put:* 1) When the need rises higher and higher, and threatens destruction. 2) When the divine help comes not at the expected hour. 3) When human support wholly fails. 4) When one's own heart doubts and is afraid.—Vers. 8–15. *Doubt of the heart tempted by unbelief as to the Lord's power and help:* 1) Its *root* in the yet unconquered self (self-love, self-will, self-conceit). 2) Its *manifestation* in disobedience to the will of the Lord. 3) Its *fruit* the loss of the blessings of divine grace.

The question of conscience: What hast thou done? 1) What it *signifies* in the sight of the Lord (vers. 8–10). 2) With what *excuses* an evil conscience answers it (vers. 11, 12). 3) What *judicial answer* the word of God gives to it (vers. 13, 14).

The steps in the fall from faith into unbelief: 1) Unrest through doubt and fear. 2) Sin in impatience and disobedience. 3) Excuses that have no ground. 4) Accusation by God's Spirit. 5) Sentence by God's word.—[It is questionable whether we should regard Saul as having had true faith in God.—Tr.]

J. Disselhoff: First steps towards the fall of an already approved servant of God: 1) From what hidden corner of the heart has come forth the stumbling-block which made him stumble. 2) What has hindered him, after stumbling, from again walking upright on his feet.—[Henry: It is not sinning that ruins men, but sinning and not repenting; falling and not getting up again. —Tr.]

[Ver. 14. Henry: Was not this hard, to pass so severe a sentence upon him and his house for a single error, and that seemed so small, and in excuse for which he had so much to say? No. (1) The Lord here shows that there is no sin little, because no little God to sin against. (2) He shows that disobedience to an express command, though in a small matter, is a great provocation; as in the case of our first parents. (3) He warns us to *take heed of our spirits;* for that which to men may seem but a small offence, yet to Him that knows from what principle, and with what disposition of mind it is done, may appear a heinous crime.—Tr.]

[Vers. 6, 7. "Man's extremity is God's opportunity."—Ver. 10. *A few minutes more*, and how great a calamity might have been averted, how great a blessing gained! (Saul could wait no longer, and yet Samuel came when he had just finished the burnt-offering, and had not yet offered the peace-offering, ver. 9.)—Ver. 12. "And I forced myself." Reluctant and self-deceived disobedience.—Ver. 13. The *folly* of disobeying God.—Ver. 14. "Jehovah hath sought him a *man after his own heart:*" 1) A man devout, not merely by fits and starts, but profoundly and habitually. 2) A man not self-willed, who would rule according to the command of God through the prophets. 3) A man who when he

had done wrong would penitently submit to God's chastening, invincibly trust in God's goodness, and faithfully strive to live more according to God's will. (In these and similar points, Saul and David might be contrasted.) MAURICE: This was the man after God's own heart, the man who thoroughly believed in God, as a living and righteous Being; who in all changes of fortune clung to that conviction; who could act upon it, live upon it; who could give himself up to God to use him as He pleased; who could be little or great, popular or contemptible, just as God saw fit that he should be. . . . How many of us feel that those who have committed grave outward transgressions may nevertheless have had hearts which answered more to God's heart, which entered far more into the grief and the joy of His Spirit, than ours ever did! (See the whole Sermon in "Prophets and Kings.")—TR.]

Chap. xiv. 1 sqq. S. SCHMID: When God has resolved to accomplish something great and wonderful through a man, He knows how in a wonderful manner so to move his spirit that, without tempting God and with a believing heart, he attempts that which is above his nature and his power.—Ver. 6. *Berlenb. Bible:* "There is no restraint to the Lord," *etc.* These words have such force that nothing can be added to them without abating their force. In so saying Jonathan goes through all apparent great perils with a spirit becoming a soul at once righteous and composed. It is true, O God, that it is no harder for Thee to deliver us by few than by many. Our strength counts for as little before Thee as our weakness.—The measure of faith is also the measure of God's help. Such a soul undertakes everything with heartiness because it does not long consider. It knows that God can do everything, and that is enough for it. The more it doubts, too, its own powers, the more it trusts the power of God.—S. SCHMID: Two points has a pious man in his performances especially to observe: one is that his faith shall confide in God's promise; the other, that he shall not doubt God's almightiness.—[*Hope, founded on faith:* 1) It is certain—a matter of faith—that the Lord can save by many or by few. 2) It may be—a matter of hope—that He will work for us. (People often say: "I have faith that we shall succeed in this enterprise." That is not properly a matter of faith, but only of hope. We *believe* that God can give success when it is His will; we *are persuaded* that our enterprise is righteous and would have desirable results; therefore we *hope* that it may prove to be God's will to give us success.)—TR.]—Vers. 18, 19. STARKE: That is the way with all hypocrites; when a rainburst of misfortune falls upon them, they are quite devout, pray industriously and seek defence and protection from God; but when the storm is past they run off again, and ask not after God, Luke xvii. 17.—[WORDSWORTH: Saul is a specimen of that class of persons who show a certain reverence and zeal for the *outward forms* of religion, and even a superstitious reliance on them, but are not careful to cherish the *inner spirit* of vital religion.—TR.]

Ver. 23. The Scriptures ascribe everything to God. And in order not to ascribe everything to the creature, they do not say: Jonathan delivered Israel, but, God saved Israel. From this we can see that a soul which truly resigns itself to God is in His hand only a poor instrument, which He is wont to use with greater advantage the less it works anything of itself, but merely follows the hand and the will of God.—Ver. 24. [WORDSWORTH: Observe his egotism. He does not call them the enemies of the *Lord*, but he says: "that *I* may be avenged on *mine* enemies;" and he speaks in this self-confident tone even after that the Lord had just marvellously interfered to save Israel.—TR.]—CRAMER: To make a vow inconsiderately is censurable, and woe to those who deliberate without consulting God, Isa. xxx. 1.—HALL: Hypocrisy is always covered with a blind and ungrateful zeal, Rom. x. 2.—S. SCHMID: The lack of foresight in those who fancy themselves quite too wise or are carried away by violent passions often lets the fairest opportunity of accomplishing something good slip between the hands.—Ver. 32. S. SCHMID: A sin seldom remains alone, and from one error always arise several others.—HALL: A hasty vow commonly brings much mischief after it.—Ver. 33. *Berlenb. Bible:* Thus do hypocrites know how to see evil in others, but not in themselves.—OSIANDER: That is the way with hypocrites, *they* will *never* be guilty, but others shall *always* be so.—Ver. 35. CRAMER: Hypocrites have the appearance of holiness; but the power of godliness they deny, 2 Tim. iii. 5: Ezek. xxxiii. 31.—OSIANDER: Hypocrites wish to be regarded as if they were promoting the honor of God and of His name, and yet in fact are seeking nothing but their own honor.—Ver. 36. STARKE: A Christian should begin nothing till he is first assured of the divine will.—*Berlenb. Bible:* Saul as a picture of stout self-reliance always wishes only to carry out his purposes without God, to get booty, make the victory greater, annihilate the enemy. It never came into his head to ask God's counsel.—Vers. 38, 39. CRAMER: God's eyes look at faith, and without that it is impossible to please God, Jer. v. 3; Heb. xi. 6.—S. SCHMID: Unjust sentences and rash oaths should not be approved, but condemned at least by silence.—Ver. 40. S. SCHMID: It is wise conduct not to oppose the authorities, but to be pleased with their words and works, so long as God's word and conscience permit.—Vers. 42-44. S. SCHMID: He who has a good conscience is not afraid of God's judgment, John iii. 21. To push justice to extremes is often to do the greatest injustice.—[SCOTT: Those who are indulgent to their own sins are generally severe in animadverting on the sins of others; and such as most disregard God's authority are most impatient when their own commands appear to be slighted.—TR.]

Vers. 1-15. *The believing spirit of God's soldiers against the enemies of God's kingdom:* 1) It confers not with flesh and blood, but makes the boldest ventures alone with its God (vers. 1-3). 2) It shrinks not back before the greatest difficulties and perils (vers. 1-6). 3) It humbly leaves success to the Lord (ver. 6, "*perhaps*," *etc.*). 4) It trusts alone in God's almightiness without regard to human might (ver. 6, "there is . . . to the Lord," *etc.*). 5) It marks the signs from the Lord, by which it becomes certain of its success

(vers. 7–12). 6) It gains, by God's help, a glorious victory (vers. 13–15).

Vers. 16–23. *The Lord helps His people in the conflict against their enemies*, in that 1) He suddenly and unexpectedly defeats them upon hidden paths and in a wonderful manner (vers. 16–19); 2) He brings their enemies into confusion and causes them to turn their weapons against each other (ver. 20); 3) The forces of His people that had yielded He rescues again and brings them back to His side (ver. 21), and 4) the disheartened and despairing He collects again to His host, to be partakers in His victory.

Vers. 24–46. *The folly of those who let themselves be ruled by carnal zeal:* 1) They are thoughtless and over-hasty in their resolutions; 2) They are unintelligent and err in the means for their aim; 3) Falling heels over head they miss the goal; 4) Led astray, they carry away with them into error and sin the men who are under their influence; 5) While in self-seeking and self-will striving after good reputation before God and men, they must before God and men be put to shame.

Vers. 35–46. *The exhortation, Let us draw near hither unto God.* 1) Whereon it *rests.* (*a*) On the nearness of God to us; (*b*) on our duty in all things to place ourselves before God's face. 2) What it *aims at.* (*a*) The clear knowledge of the will of God; (*b*) the consciousness and manifestation of our own sin before the Lord.

Ver. 37. *God's silence when we question Him is also an answer*, which 1) calls us to earnest self-examination, in order to discover to us the impure ground in our heart, from which the question proceeds, and 2) causes us to mark the divine delay as to that which we desire in a carnal way.

Ver. 45. *When is the people's voice God's voice?* 1) When it is an *echo* of that which God by His word and His deeds of grace has spoken into the heart and conscience of the people. 2) When it is a *contradiction* to that which clearly opposes the word and work of God.

Vers. 24–45. *Misuse of the name of God in the service of hypocrisy:* 1) By idle swearing in over-hasty resolutions. 2) By impenitent invocation of divine help in self-willed undertakings. 3) By zeal in the name of the Lord against other people's sins, while ignoring and concealing one's own.

Chap. XIV. J. Disselhoff: *The time between the stumbling and the fall.* We see, 1) How God's wondrous faithfulness drives Saul not to shame at his unbelief, but only to carnal zeal; 2) How he wishes to supply the half-felt want of thorough repentance by outward service of God; 3) How therefore the further gracious respite and help of God led not to upright action but to security. [The fall of Saul may be fully and instructively traced by the help of "Historical and Theological," Nos. 3 and 5.—Tr.]

SECOND SECTION.

The rejection of Saul for his disobedience in the Amalekite war.

Chapter XV. 1–35.

1 Samuel also [And Samuel] said unto Saul, The Lord [Jehovah] sent me to
anoint thee *to be* [*om.* to be] king over his people,[1] over Israel; now therefore [and
2 now] hearken thou unto the voice of the words[2] of the Lord [Jehovah]. Thus
saith the Lord [Jehovah] of hosts, I remember [have considered[3]] that which [what]
Amalek did to Israel, how he laid wait for [withstood[4]] him in the way, when he

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. Omitted in Sept. (Vat., not Alex.); Syr. has "Israel his people," while Vulg. and some MSS. have "his people Israel." These may be free renderings, or may point to different texts.—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 1. Wanting in Vat., Sept., and Vulg., and perhaps in Arab. (though Ar. קול is rather דבר than קול). The Heb. is not to be regarded as a later insertion to avoid an anthropomorphism "voice of God" (but the Targ. has "the word of the saying of Jehovah") but simply as a full expression (comp. קול י׳ vers. 20, 22 of this ch.). The Heb. קול is equivalent to "word" (as in Arab.) in the phrase "hear the voice, obey the voice of Jehovah."—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 2. The word (פקד) means "visit," "inspect," "fix the mind on," Vulg. *recensui*, Aq. ἐπεσκεψάμην. Others render (improperly) "will punish," so Sept. ἐκδικήσω. Berl. Bib. *will heimsuchen*, De Wette *ahnden*, Gesen. (*Thes. s. v.*). The signification "punish" exists, but the future sense does not accord so well with the following verse.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 2. שׂוּם with לְ "to set one's self against." In the corresponding passage in Deut. (xxv. 17–19) the word קרה is used "to go to meet" in hostile sense, and it is added "cut off thy rear-guard," which perhaps in part suggested the rendering of Eng. A. V., which is found only here, comp. Jer. ix. 7 (8). The Targ., however, has "laid wait" (כמן), and Syr. and Arab. omit.—Tr.]

3 came up from Egypt. Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy[5] all that
they have, and spare them not, but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling,
ox and sheep, camel and ass.
4 And Saul gathered [summoned] the people together [*om.* together], and num-
bered them in Telaim,[6] two hundred thousand footmen, and ten thousand men of
5 Judah.[7] And Saul came to a [the][8] city of Amalek, and laid wait[9] in the valley.[10]
6 And Saul said unto the Kenites, Go, depart, get you down from among the Ama-
lekites, lest I destroy you with them; for ye showed kindness to all the children of
Israel, when they came up out of Egypt. So [And] the Kenites[11] departed from
7 among the Amalekites. And Saul smote the Amalekites from Havilah *until* [as][12]
8 thou comest to Shur, that is over against Egypt. And he took Agag the king of
the Amalekites alive, and utterly destroyed all the people [all the people he utterly
9 destroyed] with the edge of the sword. But [And] Saul and the people spared
Agag, and the best of the sheep and of the oxen and of the fatlings [secondrate],[13]
and the lambs, and all that was good, and would not utterly destroy them; but
everything that was vile[13] and refuse, that they destroyed utterly.
10 Then came the word of the Lord [And the word of Jehovah came] unto Samuel,
11 It repenteth me that I have set up [made] Saul *to be* [*om.* to be] king; for he is
turned back from following me, and hath not performed my commandments. And
12 it grieved[14] Samuel; and he cried unto the Lord [Jehovah] all night. And when
[*om.* when] Samuel rose early[15] to meet Saul in the morning, [*ins.* and] it was told
Samuel,[16] saying, Saul came to Carmel, and behold, he set him up a place [monu-
13 ment][17] and is gone about, and passed on [over], and gone down to Gilgal. And
Samuel came to Saul,[18] and Saul said unto him, Blessed be thou of the Lord [Je-
14 hovah]; I have performed the commandment of the Lord [Jehovah]. And Sa-
muel said, What *meaneth* then [And what is] this bleating of the [*om.* the[19]] sheep
15 in mine ears, and the lowing of the [*om.* the[19]] oxen which I hear? And Saul
said, They[20] have brought them from the Amalekites; for the people spared the

[5] [Ver. 3. Sept.: "Destroy him and all his," which is preferred by Wellhausen. The Greek text contains a duplet, and the Vulg. adds "*et non concupiscas ex rebus ipsius aliquid.*" The "utterly" which Eng. A. V. everywhere employs in rendering the word חרם is as good an expression of the idea, perhaps, as is available. See translator's note in the body of the work.—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 4. Sept. "Gilgal" (see Erdmann), Syr. *Teloyo* or *Teloye*, Arab. *Tawila*. Chald., Vulg. and others have taken the word as appellative; Chald.: "by paschal lambs," on which Rashi (Breithaupt's translation) says: "Saul told every man to take a lamb from the royal flocks, and then he numbered the lambs, since it was forbidden (Gen. xvi. 10, *al.*) to number the Israelites;" Anonymous Greek version (in the Hexapla) ἄρμασιν for ἄρνασιν; Vulg.: *quasi agnos*.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 4. "It is strange that Judah forms only the twenty-first part of the army, and that 'footmen' and 'men of Judah' stand opposed to one another" (Wellh.). Syr.: "two hundred thousand footmen, and ten thousand with the men of Judah." The text is not clear.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 5. The definite Art. is better, since it was certainly the principal (possibly, the only) city of the Amalekites. Perhaps it was called Ir-Amalek (Bib. Comm.). Sept. has "cities," and so Josephus (Bib. Comm.).—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 5. On the Heb. verb-form see Erdmann.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 5. The bed of a winter-torrent, or, a ravine through which flows a brook or torrent; Arab. Wady.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 6. On account of the absence of the Art. in the Heb. Wellhausen proposes to read קַיִן (as in Numb. xxiv. 22; Judg. iv. 11).—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 7. The general direction is here given, as in Gen. xxv. 18 (where, apparently, for אֲשׁוּר we must read שׁוּר).—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 9. On the forms on this verse see Erdmann. Sept.: "the good of the flocks and of the herds and of the eatables (מַשְׁמַנִּים) and of the vines (כְּרָמִים)." For מִשְׁנִים (Eng. A. V. "fatlings)" Vulg. has *vestibus*, perhaps reading מִכְסִים, or (Bib. Comm.). שָׁנִים. Wellhausen transposes the עַל from the fourth word to the third and renders: "the best of the sheep and oxen, the fat and well-fed animals." As the text stands the third word is best rendered "second-rate," which is not satisfactory. Proposed different readings are discussed in the exposition.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 11. The meaning here is not clear. The Heb. phrase (וַיִּחַר לְ) usually means "was angry," properly "was hot, excited," not only by anger, but (as in Arab., Gesen., Fuerst) by any emotion, as grief. It is difficult, however, to establish the sense "was sorry;" the most favorable passage, Gen. xlv. 5, is not decisive, and, indeed, is commonly rendered "be not angry." If Samuel here was angry, it was either with Saul (which is improbable), or with himself (for which there is no reason), or with God (which we should not expect in Samuel), or with the general situation of affairs (which includes the others in part or in whole). The indefinite word "grieved" might therefore, be retained in the translation.—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 12. Pregnant construction for "rose up and went to meet Saul." Such constructions are common in Hebrew.—Tr.]

[16] [Ver. 12. The Sept. here badly transposes the names Samuel and Saul.—Tr.]

[17] [Ver. 12. יָד clearly here "monument." Its relation to יד "hand" and its original stem are not known.—Tr.]

[18] [Ver. 13. Sept. inserts: "and he was offering sacrifices," though it is clear from the narrative that Samuel had not seen the animals, ver. 14 (Wellh.).—Tr.]

[19] [Ver. 14. The Heb. Art. is here better omitted in Eng.—Tr.]

[20] [Ver. 15. Sept.: I.—Tr.]

best of the sheep and of the oxen to sacrifice unto the Lord [Jehovah] thy God;
16 and the rest we[20] have utterly destroyed. Then [And] Samuel said unto Saul,
Stay, and I will tell thee what the Lord [Jehovah] hath said to me this night.
And he said unto him, Say on.
17 And Samuel said, When [Though][21] thou *wast* little in thine own sight, *wast* thou
not *made* the head of the tribes of Israel, and the Lord [Jehovah] anointed thee
18 king over Israel? And the Lord [Jehovah] sent thee on a journey [way], and said,
Go and utterly destroy the sinners the Amalekites, and fight against them until
19 they be consumed.[22] Wherefore, then, didst thou not obey the voice of the Lord
[Jehovah], but didst fly upon the spoil, and didst evil in the sight of the Lord [Je-
20 hovah]? And Saul said unto Samuel, Yea[23] [*om.* yea] I have obeyed the voice
of the Lord [Jehovah][24], and have gone the way which the Lord [Jehovah] sent
me, and have brought Agag the king of Amalek, and [*ins.* the Amalekites I] have
21 utterly destroyed the Amalekites [*om.* the Amalekites]. But [And] the people
took of the spoil, sheep and oxen, the chief of the things which should have been
utterly destroyed [things devoted to destruction (or, banned)] to sacrifice unto the
22 Lord [Jehovah] thy God in Gilgal. And Samuel said, Hath the Lord [Jehovah]
as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the Lord
[Jehovah]? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat
23 of rams. For rebellion is *as* the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is *as* iniquity
and idolatry [For the sin of witchcraft is rebellion, and idolatry (or idols) and tera-
phim is stubbornness].[25] Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord [Jeho-
vah], he hath also [*om.* also] rejected thee from being king.
24 And Saul said unto Samuel, I have sinned, for I have transgressed the com-
mandment of the Lord [Jehovah] and thy words; because I feared the people and
25 obeyed their voice. Now therefore, I pray thee, pardon [And now, pardon, I pray
thee] my sin, and turn again [return] with me, that I may [and I will] worship the
26 Lord [Jehovah]. And Samuel said unto Saul, I will not return with thee; for
thou hast rejected the word of the Lord [Jehovah], and the Lord [Jehovah] hath
27 rejected thee from being king over Israel. And as [*om.* as] Samuel turned about
28 to go away, [*ins.* and] he laid hold upon the skirt of his mantle, and it rent. And
Samuel said unto him, The Lord [Jehovah] hath rent the kingdom of Israel from
thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbor of thine that is better than thou.
29 And also, the Strength[26] of Israel will not lie nor repent; for he is not a man that
30 he should repent. Then [And] he said, I have sinned; *yet* honour me now, I pray
thee, before the elders of my people and before Israel, and turn again [return]
31 with me, that I may [and I will] worship the Lord [Jehovah] thy God. So [And]
Samuel turned again [returned] after Saul; and Saul worshipped the Lord [Je-
hovah].
32 Then said Samuel [And Samuel said], Bring ye hither [*om.* ye hither] to me
Agag the king of the Amalekites. And Agag came unto him delicately [cheer-
33 fully].[27] And Agag said, Surely the bitterness of death is past. And Samuel said,

[21] [Ver. 17, The natural translation is: "though thou art little in thy eyes, art thou not head of the tribes of Israel?" as in Sept.: after which it would then be better to begin a new sentence and continue it in ver. 18. "Jehovah anointed thee and sent thee." The past rendering, however, (as in Eng. A. V. Erdmann) is possible.—Tr.]

[22] [Ver. 18. The pron. is repeated here in the Heb., probably by clerical error.—Tr.]

[23] [Ver. 20. There is nothing in the Heb. corresponding to "yea." The אֲשֶׁר here introduces *oratio recta* (as ὅτι in later Greek).—Tr.]

[24] [Ver. 20. Sept. badly "the voice of the people."—Tr.]

[25] [Ver. 23. The Heb. order, in which the predicate precedes the subject, is more forcible, and not likely to be misunderstood by most Eng. readers. So it is stronger to omit the "as" which is not in the Heb. The word rendered "iniquity" in Eng. A. V. (אָוֶן) means "nothingness," and is used of sin in general, and frequently of idolatry or idols, as here. The Vers., except Vulg. and Chald., are here confused. Chald.: "as the sin of the men who inquire by divination is the sin of every man who rebels against the word of Jehovah, and, as the sin of the people who wander after errors (idols) is the sin of every man who heaps up and adds to the words of the prophets."—Tr.]

[26] [Ver. 29. נֵצַח is variously rendered. Chald. and Syr. have same stem as Heb., idea of power, eminence; Vulg., *triumphator*; Luther, *held* (hero); Martin, *force*; Diodati, *vittoria* (victory); De Wette, *vertrauen* (confidence, trust); Van Ess., *wahrheit* (truth); Erdmann, *hort* (refuge). The Sept. and an anonymous Greek version misunderstood this word, and rendered (as if from חצץ) "and Israel shall be divided into two parts, and shall not return." The Chald. paraphrases in order to avoid the anthropomorphic expressions of the text.—Tr.]

[27] [Ver. 32. So Chaldee. Sept., "trembling," Vulg., *pinguissimus et tremens*, Aq. ἀπὸ τρυφερίας "delicately, daintily," and so Sym. ἁβρός.—Tr.]

As thy sword hath made women childless, so shall thy mother be childless among
women. And Samuel hewed Agag in pieces before the Lord [Jehovah] in Gilgal.
34 Then [And] Samuel went to Ramah; and Saul went up to his house to Gibeah
35 of Saul. And Samuel came no more to see Saul [saw Saul no more] until the day
of his death; nevertheless [for] Samuel mourned for Saul; and the Lord [Jehovah]
repented that he had made Saul king over Israel.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1-3. *The divine commission to Saul to execute judgment on Amalek.* Ver. 1 is not to be connected chronologically with ch. xii. (Then.), but continues the narrative of chs. xiii. and xiv. The solemn reminder of Saul's royal anointing and of Samuel's divine mission to that end refers not to xi. 15, but to ix. 15—x. 1. It points to the fact that the following commission is a *divine command*, communicated by the appointed organ, the prophet of God, and that the bearer of the royal office has here to perform a theocratic mission with unconditional obedience. The "*me*" stands first [such is the order in the Heb.—Tr.] in order to give prominence to the official authority, as bearer of which Samuel must needs have felt himself obliged by Saul's past conduct to assert himself over against him.—Ver. 2. The *Amalekites* were a wild, warlike desert-people, dwelling south and south-west of Judea in Arabia Petræa, descended from the same ancestor as the Edomites, and took their name from Esau's grandson Amalek (Gen. xxxvi. 12, 16; 1 Chron. i. 36). Comp. Joseph., *Antiq.* II. 1, 2, where this people is described as an Edomitic tribe, and their territory said to be part of Idumea. The mention of the "country of the Amalekites" in Gen. xiv. 7 is not in conflict with their derivation from Esau's grandson, for this (Hengst., *Pent.* II. 303 sq.) is merely a proleptical statement (comp. Winer, *W. B.* I. 51, *Anm.* 1).* In the prophecy of Balaam (Num. xxiv. 20) it is expressly mentioned as the first of the heathen nations that opposed Israel as the Lord's people, and whose destruction by Israel (comp. ver. 8) is foretold. The first hostile movement of this people is narrated in Ex. xvii. 8 sq. Soon after Israel's exodus from Egypt the Amalekites fell on their wearied rearguard in the desert of Rephidim, but were defeated by Joshua through Moses' prayer, and were doomed to extermination by the divine command (vers. 14, 16). God's command to Saul goes back to these first hostilities of the Amalekites (which were often afterwards repeated in their alliances with the Canaanites (Num. xiv. 40 sq.), with the Moabites (Judg. iii. 13), and with the Midianites (Judg. vii. 12)), the Amalekites (according to ver. 33) having newly made an inroad, with robbery and murder, on the Israelitish territory.—**I have noted what Amalek did to Israel**, that is, the whole series of Amalekite hostilities, the beginning of which is expressed in the following words: "how he withstood him" (to Heb. שָׂם supply מחנה* as in 1 Kings xx. 12), because in Ex. xvii. 14, 16, Amalek is declared the doomed hereditary and deadly enemy of Israel. Comp. Deut. xxv. 17-19.

Ver. 3. The complete extermination of the Amalekites, persons and property, as a righteous judgment of the holy God (as is intimated in the "noted" (considered) of ver. 2) is enjoined on Saul. The phrase "put everything under the ban" [this is the exact meaning of the Heb.; Eng. A. V.: "utterly destroy,"—Tr.] is explained by the following parallel phrases to mean "slaying," the "inferior being put last in each member" (Then.), and the "*both . . and*" expressing complete destruction *without exception*.—[*The Ban.* The ban, of which we have here a notable instance, was an old custom, existing probably before Moses, but formulated, regulated and extended by him. In its simplest form it was the devotion to God of any object, living or dead. (The object thus devoted was called חֵרֶם, *Cherem*, from חרם, "to separate," "set apart from common use," and from the noun comes, according to Ewald, the Heb. Hiph. "to make a thing *cherem*," "put under the ban.") When an Israelite or the whole congregation wished to devote to God anything, man, beast or field, whether for the honor of God, or to get rid of an injurious or accursed thing, it was brought and offered to the priest, and could not then be redeemed (Lev. xxvii. 28)—if living, it must be put to death. A deep consciousness of man's sin and God's holiness underlay this law. The wicked thing, contrary to the spiritual theocratic life of God's people, must be removed, must be committed to him who was the ruler and judge of the people. And so the custom had a breadth of use as well as of meaning in Israel which it never had in other ancient nations (Ew.). A city might be devoted (Deut. xiii. 12-17), or a whole nation by vow of the people (Num. xxi. 2), or by command of God (Ex. xvii. 14). In such case all human beings and cattle were to be slain, all the spoil (houses, furniture, *etc.*) to be burned, the land was to lie for some time fallow, and other things to be given to the sanctuary. From this strict rule there were occasional deviations (Num. xxxi.; Josh. ix. 3-15), but on special grounds. To spare the devoted thing was a grave offence, calling down the vengeance of God. In later times the ban was, doubtless under prophetic direction, softened, and in the New Testament times the infliction of death had quite ceased.—On this whole subject see Ew., *Alterth.* I. 101 sq. (1866), Herzog *R. E.*, *s. v.* Bann, Comm. of Kalisch and *Bib. Comm.* on Lev. xxvii —Tr.]

Vers. 4-9. *How Saul performs this divine command.*—Ver. 4. Saul *summons the people* (Heb. "make them hear," the Pi. only elsewhere in

* [Another view is that the Amalekites were an ancient Arabian tribe (Gen. xiv. 7), afterwards partially fused with Edomites (Gen. xxxvi. 12, 16). So Ewald (*Gesch.* I. 331), Knobel (*V. T.*, § 22), and see Smith's *Bib. Dict. s. v.* For the view of the text see Herzog *R. E.*, *s. v.*—Tr.]

* [That is, "set array against," instead of "laid wait for," as in Eng. A. V.—Tr.]

xxiii. 8). The *whole* of the population fit for war (see the numbers in ver. 4) appears again in arms, because the powerful Amalekites could be overthrown and destroyed only by the full force of Israel.—*Telaim* is the same with *Telem*, a southern city of Judah (Josh. xv. 24), lying, therefore, near the Amalekite territory, which agrees with Saul's choice of the place for his mustering of the army. The reading of the Sept.: "in Gilgal," is an unfortunate gloss, suggested by chs. xi. and xii.—[On the numbers see "Text. and Gram." The separate mention of Judah points possibly to a post-Solomonic date for the chapter. See Erdmann's Introduction, p. 40.—Tr.]*—Ver. 5. The name of the "*city*" of the Amalekites, against which Saul advanced, is not known.† Saul lay in *ambush* in the *valley*. To this Thenius objects that nothing more is said of an ambush, and that Saul went openly to work; but the first remark is of no importance, since it is not intended to give a full account of the battle; and as to the second, Saul was able to treat with the Kenites in the manner described the better because he had concealed his army in a gorge. According to the reading conjectured by Thenius: "and he set the battle in array" (וַיַּעֲרֹךְ מִלְחָמָה, after the Arabic [and Targ.—Tr.]: "he set the people in array there"), Saul, "already prepared for battle," must have addressed himself openly to the Kenites. But neither this declaration to the Kenites, who were living in the midst of the Amalekites, nor the withdrawal of the former from their midst could have occurred as related, if the Israelitish army had stood over against the Amalekites ready for battle. The latter would certainly not have looked quietly on while Saul withdrew the Kenites from them to himself.—*The Kenites*, a small tribe of the northwestern Arabian nomadic peoples (in Canaan as early as Gen. xv. 19), had shown friendship and kindness to the Israelites after their departure from Egypt (Num. x. 29). Moses' brother-in-law, Hobab (Judg. i. 16), belonged to them, and under his guidance it was that this kindness was shown. According to Judg. i. 16 these friendly Kenites dwelt south of the city Arad in the wilderness of Judah, that is, near the Amalekites, and near their original seat. Thence they had descended up to Saul's time farther into the Amalekite territory. Some of them settled in the north, as Heber, husband of Jael (Judg. iv. 11, 17). Another branch of the Kenites, hostile to the Israelites and in alliance with the Edomites, who dwelt in the caves of Arabia Petræa, and are without ground regarded by Hengstenberg (*Bileam*, p. 190 sq.) as a totally distinct people, are set forth in Num. xxiv. 21 as the object of God's inevitable judgment. The Kenites here mentioned (they appear also in the history of David as friends of Israel, 1 Samuel xxvii. 10; xxx. 29) are withdrawn from the punishment which was inflicted on the Amalekites.—Ver. 7. The *defeat* of the Amalekites reached from *Havilah* to *Shur*. *Havilah*, according to Gen. xxv. 18, the boundary of the Ishmaelites, probably, therefore in the south-east on the border of Arabia Petræa and Arabia Felix (according to Strabo 16, 767, the region of the *Chaulotæans*, which he puts between the Nabatæi and the Agræi). *Shur* is the present Wilderness of Jifar, the portion of the Arabian desert bordering on Egypt, into which the Israelites entered after the exodus (Ex. xv. 22). Saul thus smote the Amalekites throughout their territory from southeast towards the west and northwest.—[*Havilah* and *Shur*. Great difficulty attaches to the name Havilah on account of the different mentions of it in the Old Testament. It belongs to a Cushite (Gen. x. 7) and to a Shemitic Joktanite (Gen. x. 29), perhaps thus denoting a region in southern Arabia occupied by these two peoples. The statement in Gen. ii. 11 throws no light on the locality. It is difficult certainly to assign to this tribe (the Amalekites) a limit so far south, and we should then have to suppose a place different from those mentioned in the passages cited, and have almost no data for an opinion.—Shur is certainly in the border of Egypt; but it is not easy to fix its exact position from the Bible-statements about it (Gen. xvi. 7; xx. 1; xxv. 18; 1 Sam. xv. 7; xxvii. 8; Ex. xv. 22, 23). It seems to be here not a wilderness, but a town or fortress. As the word means "wall," and Ebers has brought out the fact that a wall extended in ancient times across the north-eastern boundary of Egypt (whence the name *Mizraim*, "the enclosed or fortified"), it is suggested by Wellhausen that the place took its name from the wall near which it was.—Tr.]—Ver. 8. *Agag* ("the *fiery*," according to the Arab.) seems to have been the official name of their kings, Num. xxiv. 7 (as Pharaoh among the Egyptians, and Abimelech among the Philistines).—That Saul did not slay Agag, but took him alive, is to be referred, from what we know of Saul, either to a fit of weak lenity and forbearance, or to a vain desire to hold the king of this people prisoner (v. Gerlach).*—*The whole people*, that is, speaking generally. Some survived of course; the Amalekites appear afterwards, xxvii. 8; xxx. 1; 2 Sam. viii. 12. Their complete annihilation is mentioned in 1 Chron. iv. 43.—Ver. 9. Besides the best of the people, king Agag, the *best* of the property, that is, among this people *herds* of course, was spared; for selfish reasons Saul and the people were unwilling to destroy the best of the booty. Besides the *best* of the small and large cattle, there is specially mentioned the best of the מִשְׁנִים, that is, the animals which held the second rank (so the Sing. denotes the second after the king, 2 Chron. xxviii. 7, the second of brothers, 1 Chron. v. 12; 1 Sam. viii. 2; xvii. 13, and the Plu. goblets of the second rank in value, Ezra i. 10). According to this it must be supposed that the herds were divided into groups according to their value. Perhaps, however, the word also means (Kimchi and Tanchum) "animals of the second birth," which were thought better than the others.—[So Rödiger in Ges. Thes., while Gesenius says incorrectly that they were inferior. Bochart (*Hieroz.* 2, 43, pp. 429–431) renders "bidentes," that is, animals which

* This war seems to be the same as that mentioned in xiv. 48; but no date is given, and the chronology throughout is difficult.—Tr.]

† וַיָּרֶב is Hiph. of אָרַב, contracted from וַיַּאֲרֵב, Ew. § 232 *a*.

* [Or, to carry him in triumph (Gill), or because of the comeliness of his person (Joseph.).—Tr.]

had shed, or were about to shed, their two long teeth, at which time they were in their prime. Other meanings have been assigned to the word, none satisfactory.—Tr.]—Fat lambs also, fattened on the meadows, are specially mentioned. The Sept. reading "vineyards" (and so Ew.) is to be rejected, because, as Then. rightly says, we have here to do with things that could be carried along. Thenius and Ewald [and Eng. A. V.] read (with Chald., Syriac, Arabic) "fatlings" (מִשְׁנִים), instead of "second-class" (as in the Heb.); but this is suspicious on account of the ease of the change.*—"And they spared *everything good.*" From this comprehensive expression, and especially from the following statement of what they destroyed, it is evident that the idea of the word "*best*" is a loosely-defined one. Namely, it expressly says, **they destroyed all property** [that was **worthless.**—Tr.]†

Vers. 10–23. By command of God *Saul* is *called to account* by Samuel for his disobedience, and his excuse being set aside, is *by God condemned and rejected.*—Ver. 10. Samuel receives a revelation from God concerning Saul's God-opposing conduct. The psychological basis of this revelation is Samuel's exact acquaintance with the condition of Saul's heart, which was already poisoned and rent by self-seeking and self-will. The way and the form in which the word of the Lord came to Samuel is not pointed out. But it is probable from what follows (Ew.) that it was by a dream. The content of the divine word is 1) the declaration: **It repenteth me that I have made Saul king.**—The *repentance of God* is the anthropopathic expression for the change of the divine procedure into the opposite of what the holy and righteous will of God had determined under the condition of holy and righteous conduct by men, when on man's side there has been a change to the opposite of this condition without repentance. Theodoret: "God's repentance is His change in administration."‡ The repentance of God always presupposes a change for the worse in man's conduct towards God, whose holiness and justice must consequently assume another relation to man; hence it cannot exist without accompanying sorrow in the divine love over the sin of man, which necessitates a changé in God's action on man's life; but it is too narrow a definition to regard it (as Keil does, on Gen. vi. 6 and here) merely as an anthropopathic expression for the sorrow of the divine love over the sin of man. Saul indeed remains the legitimate king of Israel according to the divine appointment. But, since he has not remained the humble servant of God, as which he was called to be king, God the Lord, with the deep sorrow of His holy love, must now regard and treat him as an apostate who is in conflict with the truth of the theocratic kingdom. This declaration of God's repentance itself involves the judicial decision of God, which, however, is here not yet expressly announced; rather this divine word contains 2) only the ground of God's repentance: **for he is turned back from following me, and hath not performed my commandment** [literally, *word*]. The first clause denotes internal defection from sincere fellowship of life with the Lord under the figure of a way, in which the walk after God, that is, in His retinue in fellowship with him, is performed in humble subjection to his will and command; Saul has not observed Samuel's exhortation "turn not aside from after the Lord" (xii. 20), and has gone his own way away from God. The last clause: "*and has not kept my word,*" is the external form of the defection: disobedience in the non fulfilment of the divine command. "He has *not performed* my word," that is, has fallen away, has not reached permanence, fulfilment.—A *two-fold effect* is produced by this revelation of God *on Samuel's heart.*—**To Samuel was kindled,** namely, *anger* (supply אַף, "anger," as in Gen. xviii. 30; xxxi. 36; 2 Sam. xix. 43, and many other places). That it was *holy* anger is clear from what follows; for Samuel could pray in his anger. The object of his anger was first, obviously, Saul's defection and disobedience, and then the therein-involved violation of the Lord's honor and thwarting of His purposes. To render: "was sorry" (J. Schmid: *doluit Samueli*) is inadmissible, because the expression always denotes *anger.*—[On the difficulty here see "Text. and Grammat."—Tr.]—But to *anger* at Saul's disobedience and frustration of his holy mission Samuel adds *prayer* for Saul, mighty, fervent: **he cried to the Lord,** and persistent, unremitting: **the whole night.**—The object of the prayer was doubtless not release from the fulfilment of the divine command (Ew.), but the exemption of Saul from the sentence of rejection and the forgiveness of his disobedience. But the hearing of such a prayer is conditioned on the sincere repentance of him for whom it is made. This condition did not appear in Saul, but rather its opposite. Therefore the picture of the priestly mediator, in which character Samuel represents Saul before the Lord, changes into that of the judging prophet, who represents the Lord over against Saul.—[Abarbanel says, that Samuel was angry and displeased because he loved Saul for his beauty and heroism and as his own creature whom he had made king, and that he prayed all night because God had not revealed to him Saul's sin, and he wished to know why sentence was pronounced against him.—Tr.]—Ver. 12. Having thus learned immediately from God by this revelation his *divine mission* to Saul, Samuel after this grievous night goes early *to*

* [On these names see "Text. and Grammat." No satisfactory rendering of them has yet been given."—Tr.]

† מְלָאכָה, from the connection, refers to cattle, as in Gen. xxxiii. 14—נְמִבְזָה. Ewald holds that this cannot be Niph. Part. from מִבְזָה, "contempt," and thinks the text corrupt, § 126 *b*, *Anm.* 1 [yet remarks that the book of Samuel presents many examples of strange words from the popular dialect]. Perhaps it is a mingling of נְמִזָּה, "sucked out," and נְבְזָה, "despised" (Böttcher). But it is possible that this last word was corrupted in the popular language, so as to produce alliteration with the following word by the arbitrarily inserted מ. The second predicate נָמֵס is [Ni. Partcp.] from מָסַס, "to melt," the "ruined, mangy cattle." Masc. and Fem. here stand together abnormally, as in 1 Kings xix. 11.

‡ [See Gill *in loco* for a good statement of this.—Tr.]

meet Saul. On the way he learns that *Saul had come to Carmel* (Josh. xv. 55), now Kurmul with extensive ruins dating from ancient times and the Middle Ages, southeast of Hebron [ten miles] on the mountains of Judah (comp. xxv. 2; xxvii. 3); that he had there set up a *monument* in commemoration of this great victory over Amalek. (יָד, "the hand," here denotes a monument of victory, as in 2 Sam. xviii. 18, because this, like the hand, directs attention to what it denotes.) The "*him*" [=to him] is in the whole connection significant, as it brings out the selfish principle which actuated Saul. He does not give the honor to God the Lord by unconditional obedience, but he sets up a monument in his own honor.—(וַיִּסֹּב ["is turned, gone about"] cannot mean "went in solemn procession" (Buns.), nor are we to read: "and turned *the chariot*," as Then. does after the Sept. whose translators did not understand the וַיַּעֲבֹר, "passed on.") **He passed over,** namely from Carmel and the neighboring mountain across the mountains of Judah, and then descended into the Jordan-valley to Gilgal (xiii. 4). Saul went to *Gilgal* to celebrate his victory with offerings. Thenius and Ewald insert after "Gilgal" (from Sept. and Vulg.) the words: "And Samuel came to Saul, and behold, he was offering a burnt-offering to the Lord, the firstlings of the spoil, which he brought from Amalek," supposing (but without sufficient ground) that they fell out of the Heb. because the following sentence begins with the same words. It is nowhere hinted that, according to the view of the narrator, Samuel and Saul had intended to meet on Mount Carmel (Then.). The Sept. introduced Saul's offering after the analogy of xiii. 8 sq. in order to conform this second great sin of Saul to the first.—Ver. 13. Samuel took the long journey to Gilgal to meet Saul. In the place where he had solemnly *pledged* Saul and the people to unconditional obedience (chap. xii.), he now executes *judgment* for disobedience to the divine will. The *psychological* and *ethical* momenta of this procedure are clearly exhibited in the following deeply moving narrative. After all that had occurred between Samuel and Saul (xiii.—xv. 1), Samuel's mere appearance must have been an accusation and a warning of conscience for Saul. Conscious of his sin, which, however, he will not confess,—disregarding it, and deceiving himself with all the arts of a heart entangled in hypocrisy and lies, and alienated from the Lord,—he anticipates Samuel's accusation with his defence: 1) he not only meets, but anticipates, Samuel with forced friendliness with the *greeting:* **Blessed be thou of the Lord**; and 2) straightway adds the *assurance:* **I have performed the commandment** [word] **of the Lord.**—In this he in one respect tells the truth; for he had broken the power of the Amalekites. But in another respect he tells a lie; for from selfish motives he had failed to carry out the command of complete annihilation, as given in the "word of the Lord."—Ver. 14. Saul is convicted of falsehood by the voices of the animals which he has spared contrary to God's command. Samuel's mode of citing them against him by the question: "*What mean these voices?*" has an air of holy humor and cutting irony.—Ver. 15. Saul continues to advance in falsehood and hypocrisy, receding more and more from the truthfulness of a confession of sin (which was his duty) by presenting a two-fold defence: 1) "The *people* spared," he declares; he does not blame *himself*. And yet in ver. 9 it is said: "*Saul and the people* spared." He seeks to *excuse* himself as *blameless* by transferring the blame to the people. And, suppose the people had spared the good oxen, yet he, the general, had permitted it; the people dared not do it against his will. [Comp. the people's obedience to Saul in xiv. 24, 34, 40.—Tr.] 2) He seeks to *extenuate* and to *justify* his transgression of the divine command by pleading the *holy purpose* of "*sacrificing to God.*" .... Whether now this was thought of or not, in any case it is hypocrisy, by which Saul seeks to excuse himself and the people. [*Bib. Comm.:* "Every word uttered by Saul seems to indicate the break-down of his moral character. One feels that after this scene, Saul must have forfeited his self-respect." Bishop Sanderson (quoted by Wordsworth *in loco*), in his *Lectures on Conscience*, II. § 13, exposes the futility of the pretence that *good intention* is a right rule of conscience and a good guide of conduct.—Tr.]—Ver. 16. Samuel interrupts him with the exclamation: "Stay!" (הֶרֶף Imper. apoc. Hiph. of רָפָה, "desist, cease.") To the false and hypocritical speech of Saul he solemnly and sharply opposes what *the Lord* said to him in the night. (Instead of plu. וַיֹּאמְרוּ read sing.)*—Vers. 17–19 follows the powerful, crushing address of Samuel, hurled on Saul's conscience with the might of Samuel's conviction that he now spoke as prophet solely in the name and stead of the Lord to the deep-fallen king.

First comes the *reminder* of his elevation from lowliness to the high dignity of royalty by the favor of the Lord. The question "wast thou not?" sharpens for Saul's conscience the sting concealed in this recollection. The sentence is variously construed. Kimchi renders: "though thou seemedst to thyself too little and weak to curb the people, yet wast thou the head, and shouldst as such have done thy duty"—wholly against the connection, and under the incorrect supposition that Samuel received Saul's excuse. Köster refers the expression hypothetically to the future: "if thou wouldst henceforward be humble, thou shouldst." But against this is the reference to the past fact: "the Lord anointed thee." Others (S. Schmid, De Wette, Keil) render: "*when* thou wast little, thou wast made." But אִם must retain its meaning, "*if.*" Here, as in many places (Judg. xiii. 16; Am. v. 22; Jer. v. 2; xv. 1; xxii. 24; Job ix. 15; Josh. i. 18), it="although." Ges. § 306, 2, 9 [Conant's Transl., § 155, 2 *g*.—Tr.]; Ewald, § 355, 1, 6 [1 *b*].† **Though thou wast little in thine own sight.**—The reference here to Saul's own words, ix. 21, is beyond doubt. It is the humiliating reminder to the haughty Saul of the low position whence he had been elevated to the headship of Israel, and of the modesty and humility which he then possessed. "*In thine eyes.*"

* [See a good note in *Bib. Comm.* on Samuel's complete acquiescence in the divine decision which at first (ver. 11) so grieved him, and our duty always to trust God.—Tr.]

† [On this construction see "Text. and Grammat." *in loco*.—Tr.]

Samuel here indirectly points to the *haughtiness* of his heart as the *deepest ground* of his defection from the Lord. **The Lord anointed thee.**—That was God's gracious act by which he had been raised to this height, and had incurred the most sacred obligation to be obedient to the Lord and to keep the people obedient to Him. On this foundation Samuel bases his *exhortation* in respect to Saul's guilt in this particular case.—Ver. 18. **The Lord sent thee on the** [properly a] **way and said: Go,** *etc.*—It was a distinctly marked *way* which Saul was to go according to the Lord's command, "after him;" it was a *divine mission* which he was obediently *completely* to fulfil. **The sinners the Amalekites.**—These words give the *reason* why this people was to be destroyed and not spared, because they strove to annihilate God's people and kingdom.* All this ought to have pledged thee to obedience. The question: **Why didst thou not obey the voice of the Lord?**—with the *accusation* which it contains—connects itself all the more emphatically with the reference to the duty of obedience which the Lord Himself had laid on him. The following words characterize Saul's conduct as based on avarice ["didst fly upon the spoil"]. The "fly," as in xiv. 32, expresses eagerness, passionate craving.†—Vers. 20, 21. Saul *hardens himself* still farther: 1) in *deceitful self-justification*, positively denying the fault attributed to him (following exactly the order of Samuel's specifications), and affirming with emphasis (אֲשֶׁר) that he had gone the appointed *way* and fulfilled the *mission* assigned him, witness of which was the captive Agag and the annihilated Amalekites; 2) in *vain and hypocritical excuse*, which is a mere repetition of the above pretext of the people's act and their purpose to sacrifice to the Lord the spared oxen as "firstlings of the spoil." This might have seemed a pious act, as in the similar case in Num. xxxi. 48 sq.; but, as *all the goods* of the Amalekites had been devoted—that is, consecrated—to the Lord, and the living things must be killed, no burnt-offering (according to Lev. xxvii. 29) could be made with them (see Keil). Saul evades the fact that the command of God is: Every thing is to be put under the ban (ver. 3). The words: "to the Lord *thy* God" are a sort of *captatio benevolentiæ*, an attempt to curry favor [others see here, perhaps not so well, an implied censure of Samuel, as if Saul would say: "you rebuke me for serving the God whom you profess to serve."—Tr.]

Vers. 22, 23. *Samuel's answer* tears away all the cloaks with which Saul had striven to cover his sin, and lays bare the deepest ground of evil in his *heart*. **Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the Lord?**—To give color to his open *disobedience* to the Lord, Saul adduced his purpose to make an *offering*. In opposition to this is the *meaning* of Samuel's words: offering, brought with such a disobedient heart, cannot be well-pleasing to God, as is the obedience of the will, which subjects itself unconditionally to the will of the Lord, and brings itself as offering. External offerings are an abomination to the Lord when there is lacking the heart full of obedient love, the humble consecration of the whole man. The same thought was repeatedly expressed by Samuel (xii. 14, 20, 24) in his exhortations to the people and their king, with the threat of destruction for both, if they should fail in this time-offering and service in faithful, hearty obedience to the will and commands of God. This fundamental ethical truth is affirmed, with unmistakable reference to these words of Samuel, in the classical passages Ps. l. 8–14; li. 18, 19; Isa. i. 11; comp. 16–19; Mic. vi. 6–8; Hos. vi. 6; Jer. vi. 20.—In the following words: **To obey is better than sacrifice,** the thought takes a new turn: apart from what alone is well-pleasing to God, only an obedient disposition of mind is in itself something good, the offering, without such a disposition, is not a good thing, has no moral value. The "fat of rams," that is, the pieces of fat offered on the altar [see Lev. i. and many other places.—Tr.].—Ver. 23. The thought is carried on as follows: As the outward work of offering without answering devotion of heart and life to God with obedient mind has no moral value, and is not an object of the divine good-pleasure, so disobedience and the thence-resulting rebellion and defiant self-dependence is similar in essence to, stands on the same moral plane with the outward wickedness of *witchcraft*, that is, "divination in the service of anti-godly demon-powers" (Keil), and of *idolatry*. אָוֶן [Eng. A. V. "iniquity"] is "nothingness," then "false god" and "idol," Isa. lxvi. 3, "idol-worship," Hos. x. 3. *Teraphim* [Eng. A. V. "idolatry"] are household-gods as oracle-deities and dispensers of good fortune, Gen. xxxi. 19. Comp. Keil, *Archäol.*, § 90 [and Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, Arts. "Teraphim" and "Magic," *Commentaries* of Kalisch, Delitzsch, Lange and *Bib. Comm.* on Gen. xxxi. 19. Samuel's decided condemnation of teraphim-worship (which he clearly did not regard as a permissible form of Jehovah-worship) is to be noted.—Tr.].—For the sake of emphasis the predicates in both clauses stand before the subjects. As in divination and idolatry the living God is denied and rejected, so is rebellion and stubbornness a defection from the Lord and a rejection of the Lord.* This is the *ground* (כִּי) of the declaration in ver. 22. Now follows the sentence thus grounded, with sharp brevity concluding this part of the scene: **Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath rejected thee from being king**†—Rejected by the Lord, Saul is now himself abandoned "to his self-love and his passions" (*Berl. Bib.*).

Vers. 24–31. *Saul's vain striving with Samuel in false penitence, and Samuel's sentence of rejection.* Ver. 24. Saul *confesses:* **I have sinned.**—To judge from his previous obstinate refusal to acknowledge his wrong, Samuel's earnest and powerful address must have worked on his inner life like a circle of fire ever closing in upon his

* Instead of כְּלוֹתָם read ־תָךְ with Sept., Chald., Syr., Arab.

† תַּעַט Impf. Qal. of עיט with Dag. *forte implic.* Ges. § 72, Rem. 9.

* [On the difficult subject of the nature of witchcraft and its treatment in the Old Testament see Art. "Magic" in Herzog's *R. E.*—Tr.]

† מִן with subst. may be predicate when a preceding closely attached verb leaves no doubt as to the sense, Ew. § 337 *b*.

conscience, so that he saw himself forced to abandon his attempts at palliation and frankly make this confession of sin. The whole preceding narrative shows that it was *extorted* from him partly by the unsparing revelation of his lies and hypocrisy and the undeniable exhibition of his heart-rooted disobedience, partly by the judicial decision respecting the unavertible consequences of his defection and disobedience. A confession of sin induced by resulting evil and punishment is often no expression of true penitence. And it is not this with *Saul;* for though he now confesses that he has transgressed the commandment of the Lord, he yet shows that he is not thinking solely of the Lord, since he adds: "*and thy word.*" His conduct before and after this throws light on this apparently unimportant statement of his; powerfully impressed by Samuel's word, he puts it alongside of the word of the Lord; he is concerned to regain Samuel's good-will and approbation. This regard for Samuel's *human* authority, which ought to vanish out of sight before God's authority, springs from the same root in his heart (lack of humble fear and simple obedience towards God) as the fear of men and desire to please men which he himself now gives as the reason for his disobedience: **For I feared the people and obeyed their voice.**—*Berl. Bib.:* "Here stands revealed the hypocrite, who loved the honor of men more than the favor of God. The people must still bear the blame." Instead of fearing God, he feared the people, he the *king*, who in this, therefore, was guilty of unpardonable weakness; he obeyed the voice of the people instead of God's voice out of fear of man, if indeed the people did make the demand. And yet in all his confession of sinful regard for men his purpose is evidently to soften his guilt by bringing in the people.—[Ex. xxiii. 2: Thou shalt not follow the multitude into evil.—Tr.]—He prays *Samuel:* **And now, pardon my sin.** He does not turn straightway to *God* with this prayer; the "*and now*" indicates his belief that he might expect the fulfilment of his prayer in return for his confession of sin. Samuel turns from him, perceiving that the confession and prayer do not come from a truly penitent heart. To this Saul's request refers: **Return with me that I may worship the Lord.**—Confession, renewed excuse, cry for forgiveness, request to Samuel to remain, desire to approach God, all follow one after another in painful haste. Saul is smitten by his conscience; but his heart is not broken. He *nevertheless* gives not *God* the *honor*. Ver. 26. Samuel, seeing through him, shortly and decidedly rejects his request, and instead repeats his previous judicial sentence, because Saul's desire for forgiveness sprang not from a penitence directed to God, but from a self-loving penitence, whose aim was his own advantage; for he did not trouble himself about his having dishonored God, but was afraid that he might lose the kingdom.—Ver. 27. Samuel's turning away from Saul was a vigorous confirmation of his rejection, and a sign that he would henceforth have no association with him. The impression which the narrative makes on us of a vehement, unquiet and disordered mind is heightened to the utmost by this moving scene in which Saul seizes the skirt of Samuel's mantle in order to arrest his departure, uses physical force, that is, to attain his end: **and it was rent.**—[It is plain that it is Saul that tears Samuel's garment undesignedly. Some Jewish writers held that Samuel symbolically tore Saul's garment or his own (Gill).—Tr.]—Ver. 28. Samuel uses this as a symbol to show Saul that the Lord had that day *rent* the kingdom from him. The second part of Samuel's address declares that the theocratic kingdom was to be given to another, "*thy neighbor,*"—an indefinite expression, since Samuel did not yet know whom the Lord had chosen—**who is better than thou,** that is, who would walk obediently in the ways of the Lord. Before it was said: "the Lord hath rejected thee from the kingdom;" now it is said: the Lord hath rent the kingdom *from thee.* Samuel, who for the *third* time announces the rejection of Saul (whose spiritual steadfastness constantly diminishes), expressly emphasizes the fact that the Lord has rejected him not merely *personally*, but as the theocratic *king*. In ch. xiii., on the other hand, it was declared that the *kingdom* should not remain permanently in his family. Though now Saul retained the kingdom some years after this rejection, God's relation to him was, in consequence of his apostasy, completely altered; he no longer looked on him as the organ of His will, and withdrew from him the power and gifts of His Spirit. His external royalty remained as a divine appointment; but its inner core was rejected; Saul, as bearer of the royal office, was rejected, because he had rejected the Lord.—Ver. 29. Samuel declares this divine sentence to be unavertible and unavoidable: **And also the Refuge of Israel will not lie nor repent; for he is not a man that he should repent,** that is, the *judicial decision*, by which the Lord has inflicted on thee the penalty of rejection, remains unchanged and unchangeable by reason of His immutable will. "*And also*" introduces this sentence as something new="in addition to this." נֵצַח="steadfastness, permanence," then subjectively "trust, confidence" (Lam. iii. 18), then the object of trust, of God: the *Refuge** [Eng. A. V. Strength]. The same declaration of the unchangeableness of the divine decisions, only in reference to His *promise of blessing*, is found in Num. xxiii. 19. Comp. Jer. iv. 28; Ezek. xxiv. 14. The apparent contradiction between this declaration ("The Lord does not repent") and that in vers. 11, 35 ("The Lord repented") is by some expositors harmonized by remarking (Clericus) that here (ver. 29) the words are said θεοπρεπῶς [as becomes God], and are there to be understood ἀνθρωποπαθῶς [after the manner of men]; but this does not offer a complete solution of the question, since the expression "it repented the Lord," rightly understood after being divested of its human dress, is the appropriate expression of a real manifestation of the unchangeable divine being and will, only this latter must occupy a different relation to the man who has himself changed. In contrast with man, who repents because his will changes, God is here declared by Samuel to be (in respect to Saul) the unchangeable God, who cannot contradict Himself, as would be the case if He retracted

* [On this word see "Text. and Grammat."—Tr.]

His decision concerning the impenitent Saul; while in ver. 41 and ver. 35 the same unchangeable God is described in human phrase according to the changed relation which His unvarying holy and righteous will must occupy to men when they recede from the religious-moral relation to Him, under which He has hitherto in holiness and righteousness revealed Himself.—Ver. 30. Not even by this overwhelming declaration of the irrevocable character of God's sentence, founded, as it was, in the unchangeableness of His holy and righteous will, is the excited Saul silenced. Two things, he says, wherein is displayed the real selfishness and self-love of his heart. First he repeats his confession of sin. But it is only in *one* word: "I have sinned." And that this was a hypocritical one is shown by what follows:—**Yet, honour me now, I pray thee, before the elders of my people and before Israel, and return with me that I may** [better, "and I will,"—TR.], **worship the Lord thy God.** How many words, spoken with passionate haste, against that one cold introductory word "I have sinned!" If the Lord's sentence of rejection is irrevocable, Saul will at least before men save the halo of royal honor. His inner man is revealed. He did not honor the Lord by obedience, and when his disobedience was held up before him, he persistently denied the Lord His honor in his impenitent mind. Now comes to light the deepest-lying ground of this conduct. He is concerned about his own honor. In his self-seeking he has clean cast loose from the Lord and withdrawn into himself. [If Saul had been really penitent, he would have prayed to be humbled rather than to be honored (Gregory, quoted by Wordsworth).—TR.]. **And Samuel returned after Saul.** He then acceded to Saul's request, not, of course, to yield to his selfish opposition to God's honor, but to preserve unimpaired in the eyes of the people the position of Saul's kingdom, which though theocratically rejected, yet still in fact by God's will remained, and especially not to be wanting in the sacrifice of the people.

Ver. 32 sq. What Saul had disobediently neglected, Samuel executes in the name of the Lord, namely, the extermination of Amalek by slaying king Agag.—Agag appeared before Samuel cheerfully; the word occurs in Ps. xxix. 17 in the sense of "*joy*." His words: **Surely, the bitterness of death is past** agree with his joyful mood. S. Schmid sees in them the feigned courageousness which cowards can put on. Others understand a real heroic contempt of death in the presence of death. Probably, however, Agag, not having been slain by Saul, was all the surer of life when he was led from the king to Samuel [since Samuel was an old man and a priest.—TR.]. —Ver. 33. Samuel's words, however, must have immediately shown him his error. They presuppose that Agag had acted with great cruelty in his marauding and military expeditions: "As thy sword has made women childless, so shall thy mother be the most childless [or, be childless] among women;" that is, "because in her son she loses at the same time the king of her people" (Bunsen).—There can be nothing surprising in Samuel's "hewing Agag in pieces" for one who from the theocratic point of view regards Agag's death as a necessity founded in the divine decree, and sees in Samuel the divine instrument for the fulfilment of the divine will, coming in place of him who in spite of his call thereto has refused obedience and service. Grot.: "When kings abandoned their duty, God often executed His law by prophets" 1 Kings xviii. 40. [Samuel's act was not one of revenge, not an individual execution of justice, but a simple carrying out for the people of the ban-sentence pronounced against Amalek by Jehovah.—TR.].—Ver. 34 sq. The notice that Samuel returned to *Ramah* and Saul to *Gibeah* is a significant introduction to the important statement that henceforth *Samuel broke off all communication with Saul:* **He saw him no more to the day of his death.** Maurer: "He *went to see* Saul no more." This does not contradict xix. 24, according to which *Saul* once more met him. All intercourse with Saul on Samuel's side ceased from now on, since God had rejected him, and Samuel could have met him only as messenger and prophet of God. From this also we see that Saul's kingship, though still one *de facto*, yet from this time lost its theocratic relation. God's ambassador was recalled from him; the intercourse of the God of Israel with Saul through His Spirit came to an end, because Saul, sinking step by step away from God, had by continued disobedience and increasing impenitence given up communion with God.—In keeping with the above mention of Samuel's fervent, continued prayer for Saul is the statement: "For Samuel mourned for Saul;" this was the *human* sorrow for this highly-gifted, highly-favored, and hopelessly-sunken man; then follows the deeply pathetic statement: "The Lord repented, *etc.*;" this was the *divine* sorrow over the loss of this chosen instrument.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. When the Scriptures speak of God's *repentance*, *anger*, *zeal*, and the like, ascribing to Him human affections and dispositions, and consequently changes, we cannot regard these anthropopathisms as *merely* figurative statements; these representations, after leaving out the ungodly human element, as Nitzsch (*Syst.*, § 79 A. 2) remarks, have "realness and validity; it is not a human, but a divine movement that is spoken of, and we must therefore deny that it is sinful and passionate, but not that it is efficient and true." The anthropopathic representations set forth a real relation of the living God to man who bears His image, only described from a human standpoint. They are the means of maintaining vigorously and effectively the thought of the living God and His real relation to man, and of saving it from being dissipated in abstractions. Kling admirably says on the two passages in point in this chapter (Art. "Reue" in Herzog): "The latter (ver. 29 "he does not repent") refers to the firm, irrevocable resolution to give the kingdom to a better man; the repentance (ver. 11) looks to the fact that Saul, an humble man when he was called and fitted to discharge his duty in faith and obedience, was now changed, exalted himself in his office, would be his own master, and, setting aside God's express command, followed his own pleasure. Thus he showed himself no longer

fit to be king in Israel, God's people, and the divine will, which made him king, changed to the opposite,—a repentance which betrays no mutability in God, but rather reveals His constancy alongside of the mutability of man, His unvarying will that the humbly obedient shall be king in Israel."

2. *Persistent impenitence* towards the holy and righteous God, as it is exemplified in Saul, has its deepest ground in the unwillingness to subordinate one's own self, especially one's own will to the holy will and the gracious will of God. It leads to hypocrisy, which seeks to cover its own wrong with works of external piety, or lays the blame on outward circumstances and other men. Before the irrefragable self-revelation of the holy and righteous God the impenitent man, despite his concealing lies and hypocrisy, must ever reveal new hidden sins, ever involve himself from step to step in new sins, till the deepest depth of his sinful heart is displayed in self-seeking, self-love, and self-will; and if the sinner will not even then humble himself and take refuge in the grace of God, there comes the judgment of inner hardening, by which the man becomes insusceptible to the influences of God's Spirit and word, and incapable of turning to God, since the will confirms itself in permanent opposition to God; the end is the divine judgment of rejection. See the separate steps of this process in the Exposition of the Section.

3. The word: "*Obedience is better than sacrifice*" is the refutation of a twofold error: 1) that man can gain God's approval by outward works, apart from a spirit of true obedience in which heart and will are given up and subjected to Him; 2) that man can by such works absolve himself from the performance of moral duties, and escape the guilt and punishment of his disobedience to God.—This declaration further indicates the true relation between the ceremonial law and the moral law. The holy usages of the former, especially sacrifices, do not occupy towards the demands of the latter the relation of the Outward to the Inward. "Every ceremonial law is moral; the outward act is never enjoined but for the sake of the inward thing, what it pictures—represents. Never is there body without spirit. But the fleshly sense would have none of the spirit, and laid hold solely of the body, which thus isolated became a corpse." Hengst. *Einl. zu* Ps. l. That word contains the principle of and lays the foundation for the position which the prophetic Order (after Samuel's example) takes towards the sacrificial worship and the fulfilment of the ceremonial law in general. Not the offering absolutely is rejected, but the outward work without the root of love to God (Deut. vi. 5) and of the obedience whence alone it can spring as fruit well-pleasing to God. On the relation between the teaching of the Mosaic law and this *prophetical* doctrine (which dates from this word of Samuel) of the necessity of the sacrifice of a pious heart and an humbly obedient will in contrast with external service according to the prescriptions of the ritual law, Oehler (Herz. XII. 228) says: "The prophets, by bringing out the difference between the ritual and moral laws, and by declaring the merely outward service to be in itself worthless—and valid only as the expression of a godly will, merely logically developed Mosaism, which indeed commonly puts the moral and the ritual, the inward and the outward immediately *side by side*, but therein indicates not unclearly the sense and aim of its teaching, partly by basing all laws on the divine elective grace and the divine holiness, partly in the fact that even the ritual ordinances of the Law every where display a spiritual meaning, and thus awaken a dim conception of moral duties. On the other hand, Prophecy by inserting in its pictures of the Messianic times essential features of the old ceremonial, shows that it holds fast the divine significance and warranty of the ritual law."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1. BERLENB. BIBLE: Although Saul was rejected by God on account of his disobedience, yet God left him still king, so that he was bound to carry out the will of God.—[HENRY: Samuel plainly intimates that he was now about to put Saul upon a trial, in one particular instance, whether he would be obedient to the command of God or no. And the making of this so expressly the trial of his obedience, did very much aggravate his disobedience.—GILL: And whereas he had been deficient in one instance before, for which he had been reproved [chap. xiii.], he suggests that *now* he should take care to observe and do, particularly and punctually, what should be enjoined him.—TR.] It is impossible to be truly a king and to rule in the church, if one does not yet know the voice of the Lord, and cannot distinguish it from the voice of reason and nature.

Vers. 2, 3. STARKE: God's judgments, though they come slowly, yet come certainly and at the right time (Exodus xxxii. 34).—[HALL: He that thinks, because punishment is deferred, that God hath forgiven or forgot his offence, is unacquainted with justice, and knows not that time makes no difference in eternity.—TR.]—SCHLIER: When God the Lord commands such a war of annihilation, then this is no war of human vengeance; still less is it an ambitious war of conquest—but it is a judgment of divine wrath.

Ver. 6. CRAMER: We must beware of communion with the ungodly, that we may not be swept away with them (Rom. xviii. 4).—OSIANDER: God requites to the pious even their forefathers' good works and benefits, which they have done to their neighbor. Who then will say that it is vain to serve God (Mal. iii. 14).—SCHLIER: Thus does every good thing reward itself; nothing remains forgotten; often in later centuries the seed sown in an old past yet every where comes up gloriously, and children and children's children derive advantage from the good done by the fathers.—Vers. 8, 9. STARKE: Not what seems to us good are we to do, but what God will have from us (Jer. vii. 23). Avarice leads to great sins, especially to untimely compassion (1 Tim. vi. 10).—S. SCHMID: No one is more foolish than he who wishes to be wiser than God, and ventures to explain God's word and commandments according to what seems good to him.—Vers. 10, 11. "It repenteth me."—BERLENB. BIBLE: Such feelings must in the case of God be understood in a divine manner, and not as in the case of change-

able men in a human manner; they must be understood more in the effect than in the affection, of God's unchangeable righteousness, which moves Him to withdraw His special grace and to withhold His hand, the cause of every change that takes place among His creatures.—[GILL: Though God repented He made Saul king, He never repents of His making His saints kings and priests for Himself. His outward gifts He sometimes takes away, as an earthly crown and kingdom; but His gifts and callings which are of special grace are without repentance, Rom. xi. 29.—TR.]

Ver. 12. OSIANDER: The lost sheep we must diligently seek, if perhaps they may be brought to the right way.—Ver. 13. [HENRY: Thus sinners think by justifying themselves to escape being judged of the Lord; whereas the only way to do that is by *judging* ourselves.—TR.]—STARKE [from HALL]: No man brags so much of holiness as he that wants it (Lu. xviii. 11, 12).—[WORDSWORTH: Here is a proof that a man may be blinded by his own self-will, and that he may imagine that his own way is right, while it is leading him to the gate of death (Prov. xiv. 12; xvi. 25). It is not enough for a man to be approved by his own conscience; but it is necessary to regulate the conscience by God's Will and Word (Acts xxvi. 9; 1 Tim. i. 13).—TR.]—Vers. 14, 15. S. SCHMID: God knows how to bring men's sins to light, however great the care with which they may be cloaked.—STARKE: Nothing remains concealed, and sooner than the sins of the ungodly should fail to be reported, the irrational creatures themselves must reveal them. [HALL: Could Saul think that Samuel knew of the asses that were lost, and did not know of the oxen and sheep that were spared? ..... Much less when we have to do with God Himself should dissimulation presume either of safety or secrecy. Can the God that made the heart, not know it?—TR.]—Ver. 15. [From HALL]: It is a shameful hypocrisy to make our commodity the measure and rule of our execution of God's command, and under pretence of godliness to intend gain.—OSIANDER: Hypocrites will not come right out with the confession of their sin, but desire always to excuse and palliate it.—BERL. BIBLE: Beware of covering thy ungodly heart with the cloak of religion, and consider that the day is coming on which God will make manifest what is hidden in darkness and the counsel of men's hearts (1 Cor. iv. 5).—Ver. 16. S. SCHMID: We must not look to what hypocrites say of themselves, but to what God's word says of them.—BERL. BIBLE: Hold on! speak not many vain words to cloak and to palliate! The stitches do not hold. Happy he in whose spirit there is no guile (Ps. xxxii. 2). [SCOTT: The unhumbled heart, however, will never be at a loss to excuse or palliate the most evident criminality; and it will always be necessary for preachers to drive sinners from their subterfuges, to show them the malignity and aggravation of their offences, to silence their objections and excuses, and urge conviction upon their hearts, though the convincing Spirit of God alone can render the means effectual (Jo. xvi. 8, 11).—TR.]

Ver. 20. CRAMER: That is the way with hypocrites, that they make themselves fair, and yet are not washed from their filthiness (Proverbs xxx. 12). They boast of their works, and their hand kisses their mouth (Job xxxi. 27; Luke xviii. 11).—BERL. BIBLE: Saul makes his cause worse and worse, while he wishes to be guiltless, yea, even to be in the right towards God, as if he had executed every thing quite well, even after Samuel had already censured him and sought to arouse his conscience. It is accordingly not only a single sin, but many there come together. He contradicts the prophet, he denies that he has been disobedient; he makes light of his fault, even if any fault were granted, and throws it to and fro from himself to the people; he uses the service of God for a pretext and cloak of excuse, like a vile hypocrite who has little respect for God's omniscience. See what tricks corrupt nature can devise? How crafty it is in its concealment! How many kinds of subterfuges it employs to defend itself!—Ver. 21. OSIANDER: It is a horrible crime when any one wishes to cloak his avarice, disobedience and other crimes with religious devotion (Jo. xii. 4-6).—BERL. BIBLE: How many engaged in God's worship deceive themselves herein, who think it is enough to offer something temporal to the Lord, when meanwhile they are constantly maintaining their own disposition and their own will!—[SCOTT: When the Lord expressly says, "Thou shalt," and His rational creature dares to persist in saying, "I will not," whether the contest be about an apple or a kingdom—it is "stubbornness" and "rebellion"—a contempt of the commandment of God, and a daring insult to His majesty and authority.—TR.]—J. LANGE: Even in the Levitical worship God always and chiefly looked to the *inner* (Ezek. vi. 6; Ps. li. 18, 19). My fellow-Christian! make thy Christianity then consist not in the outward but in the inward, and worship God in spirit and truth (Jo. iv. 24).—BERL. BIBLE: May we then take good care that even when we mean to render the Lord service or obedience, we yet beware of our choice and fancy, and follow only the traces of the divine will, and thereby escape from ourselves or break and tame our own will. Obedience is the mother-grace, the parent of all virtues. It makes the eye see, the ear hear, the heart think, the memory remember, the mouth speak, the foot go, the hand work, and the whole man do that, yea, that alone, which is conformed to the will of God. All these and other things are valuable only in so far as they agree with the will of God.

Ver. 23. S. SCHMID: It is a dreadful fault when one wishes to make light of gross sins. An honest servant of God represents the greatness of the sins according to the truth and prescription of the word of God.—TUEB. BIBLE: God rejects no one unless he is before rejected by Him. —BERL. BIBLE: It is impossible for him who is not obedient to God to lay any command upon men. That is what these words and the aim of God therein mean.—The authorities must not proceed according to their own will and notion, but in everything must take God's word and will for their rule.—If He does not drive them (the apostate rulers) from their position, like as He did Nebuchadnezzar, but leaves them ruling, as He also did Saul for a while, yet they are and remain rejected in His might, and vainly write themselves "by the grace of God," when He Himself does not so acknowledge them.—[On vers. 22, 23, there is a sermon by Jeremy Taylor,

chiefly on rebellion, in which he uses singular arguments to justify religious persecution.—Tr.]

Ver. 24. Osiander: That is the way with hypocrites, that they do not outright and freely confess their sins, but push the guilt, as far as ever they can, from themselves upon others.—Ver. 26. Berl. Bib.: Every one wonders that God, who is yet so full of compassion, does not forgive Saul, though elsewhere He never refuses forgiveness to any repented sin. But it is due to the fact that the longing after forgiveness in Saul proceeded from no such repentance as God had in view, but from a self-loving repentance, which had only its own advantage as aim. For he was not troubled that he had dishonored God, but was in fear that he might lose the kingdom.—Ver. 29. Osiander: Although God, so long as we do not repent, does not change His threatenings, but certainly carries them into execution, yet if we earnestly repent and better our lives, He does repent of the evil which He had threatened to do us if we had gone on in sin (Jer. xviii. 7 sqq.); and such a change is not instability in God, but grace and goodness.

Ver. 30. Berlenburger Bible: "Honor me, I pray thee." That shows what he is mainly concerned about (Jno. v. 44; xii. 43); loss and shame he would like to escape, and as he cannot deceive God, he wishes to deceive men by the appearance of God's favor.—Wuert. Bib.: Hypocrites bewail and lament in their repentance only the chastisements they have to suffer, and not their sins; they seek only their own, and not God's honor (1 Kings xxi. 27).—[S. Gregory (in Wordsworth): If Saul had been really penitent, he would have prayed to be humbled, rather than to be honored.—W. M. Taylor: There came to the son of Kish a tidal time of favor, which if he had only recognized and improved it, might have carried him not only to greatness, but to goodness. But he proved faithless to the trust which was committed to him, and became in the end a worse man than he would have been, if no such privileges had been conferred upon him. . . . . As his life wore on, the good features in his character disappeared.—Tr.]—Ver. 33. S. Schmid: Although the right of retaliation has no place in personal revenge, yet it is righteously exercised in public judgments (Lev. xxiv. 20). To execute God's strict judgment with a spirit free from all thirst for vengeance, is no barbarity.

J. Disselhoff on vers. 1–21. *The fall of King Saul* shows: 1) How unrepented and only whitewashed sin at the first severe temptation breaks out as manifest and criminal self-seeking; 2) How this self-seeking is so blinding as to tell itself and others the lie that it is a labor for the Lord.—*The same* on vers. 20–23. *Sacrifice or obedience?* 1) A sacrifice which lacks obedience of heart is an abomination in the sight of God; 2) Where obedience of heart is, there is also the true sacrifice, well-pleasing to God.—*The same* on vers. 23–31. *Beware of a Saul's confession.* That you may do this, it is necessary to know two things: 1) What a Saul's confession is; 2) What a Saul's confession works.

Vers. 1–11. *God's curse and blessing:* 1) Long delayed, but not revoked; 2) At last fulfilling itself according to God's truth and righteousness.

Vers. 22–3. *Sacrifice and obedience:* 1) Sacrifice without obedience (worthless in the sight of the Lord, perilous for men); 2) Obedience the best sacrifice (on what ground, with what blessed result).

Vers. 10–31. *Seeming repentance before the Lord:* 1) How it conceals from the Lord the root of sin in the heart; 2) draws the garment of self-righteousness over sin; 3) thereby leads from sin to sin; and 4) drives on towards the judgment of hardening and rejection.

[Ver. 11. *The Lord repented:* 1) in what sense, 2) for what reasons, 3) with what results. (Comp. "Exeg." on vers. 11 and 29, and "Hist. and Doct.," No. 1.)—Ver. 11. Praying in vain.—Vers. 11, 16. Grieving, but faithful.—Vers. 12, 13. The glory and the shame of Saul—his victory, his disobedience, his efforts to hide and palliate his offence. (This would embrace nearly the whole chapter.)—Vers. 20–1. Eclectic obedience.—Ver. 23. The rejecter rejected. Comp. Rom. i. 24, 26, 28; John iii. 18, 19.—Ver. 27. Clinging to the religious teacher, while not clinging to religion.—Vers. 30–1. Worshipping to save appearances.—Ver. 32. To be without fear of death is not proof of preparation for death.—Tr.]

THIRD DIVISION.

THE DECLINE OF SAUL'S KINGDOM, AND THE ELEVATION OF DAVID. FROM SAUL'S REJECTION TO HIS DEATH.

CHAPTERS XVI.—XXXI.

FIRST SECTION.

Early History of David, the Anointed of the Lord.

CHAP. XVI.

I. *Choice and Anointing of David as King through Samuel.* Chap. XVI. 1–13.

1 AND the Lord [Jehovah] said unto Samuel, How long wilt thou mourn for Saul,
seeing I have rejected him from reigning over Israel? Fill thine horn with oil,
and go, I will send thee to Jesse the Bethlehemite, for I have provided[1] me a king
2 among his sons. And Samuel said, How can I go? If Saul hear it, he will kill
me. And the Lord [Jehovah] said, Take an heifer with thee, and say, I am come
3 to sacrifice to the Lord [Jehovah]. And call Jesse to the sacrifice,[2] and I will
show thee what thou shalt do; and thou shalt anoint unto me him whom I name
4 unto thee. And Samuel did[3] that which the Lord [Jehovah] spake, and came to
Bethlehem. And the elders of the town [city][4] trembled at his coming [went
5 tremblingly to meet him], and said, Comest thou peaceably [in peace]?[5] And he
said, Peaceably [In peace]; I am come to sacrifice unto the Lord [Jehovah];
sanctify yourselves, and come with me to the sacrifice.[6] And he sanctified Jesse and
6 his sons, and called them to the sacrifice. And it came to pass, when they were
come, that he looked on Eliab and said, Surely the Lord's [Jehovah's] anointed is
7 before him. But [And] the Lord [Jehovah] said unto Samuel, Look not on his
countenance [appearance],[7] or [nor] on the height of his stature, because [for] I
have refused him; for *the Lord* [*Jehovah*] *seeth*[8] not as man seeth, for man looketh
8 on the outward appearance, but the Lord [Jehovah] looketh on the heart. Then
[And] Jesse called Abinadab, and made him pass before Samuel. And he said,
9 Neither hath the Lord [Jehovah] chosen this [him]. Then [And] Jesse made
Shammah to pass by. And he said, Neither hath the Lord [Jehovah] chosen this
10 [him]. Again, [And] Jesse made seven of his sons to pass before Samuel. And

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. Literally "seen." For similar use of ראה see Gen. xxii. 8; Deut. xxxiii. 21.—TR.]

[2] [Ver. 3. Chald. has "sacrificial meal," perhaps simply as a connected fact, perhaps to avoid apparent infringement on priestly functions. Vulg. has *victimam*, other VSS. as Heb.—TR.]

[3] [Ver. 4. Sept.: "all that the Lord spake to him."—TR.]

[4] [Ver. 4. It is better to give a uniform rendering to עִיר, the distinction between "town" and "city" not being found in Heb.—TR.]

[5] [Ver. 4. Literally: "is thy coming peace? and he said, peace." Sept. inserts at the end of the verse the words "O Seer."—TR.]

[6] [Ver. 5. Sept.: "and rejoice with me to-day," probably a free reference to the festive character of the sacrificial meal; so Chald has "meal" instead of "sacrifice."—TR.]

[7] [Ver. 7. מַרְאֵהוּ, Sept. ὄψιν, Erdmann "*gestalt*," properly the whole personal appearance. Vulg. *vultum*, whence perhaps Eng. A. V. Luther, "*gestalt*."—TR.]

[8] [Ver. 7. These words wanting (but understood) in the Heb., are found in the Sept. "God seeth," and are for clearness better retained. Chald. and Syr. omit as Heb.; Vulg. supplies the words: *ego judico*.—TR.]

11 Samuel said unto Jesse,[9] The Lord [Jehovah] hath not chosen these. And Samuel
said unto Jesse, Are here all *thy* children [the young men]? And he said, There
remaineth yet the youngest, and behold, he keepeth the sheep. And Samuel said
12 unto Jesse, Send and fetch him, for we will not sit down till he come hither. And
he sent and brought him in. Now [And] he was ruddy,[10] *and* [*om.* and] withal
of a beautiful countenance [with beautiful eyes withal], and goodly[11] to look to
13 [at]. And the Lord [Jehovah] said, Arise, anoint him, for this is he.[11] Then
[And] Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren.
And the Spirit of the Lord [Jehovah] came upon David from that day forward.
So [And] Samuel rose up and went to Ramah.

[9] [Ver. 10. Sept. (Vat. but not Alex.) omits "unto Jesse," perhaps (Wellhausen) because Jesse was supposed not to know Samuel's purpose. In ver. 6 Samuel's "said" is equivalent to "thought."—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 12. This word אַדְמוֹנִי is found only here, 1 Sam. xvii. 42 and Gen. xxv. 25, and in the two last passages seems to refer to the color of the skin. The ancient VSS. do not decide. Chald. and Syr. use same word here as in Gen. xxv. 25; Vulg. *rufus*, Sept. *πυῤῥάκης*. Some moderns render "red-haired." Levy renders the Chald. "red-eyed."—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 12. Sept.: "goodly in appearance to the Lord," and "for he is good," to preserve the moral aspect of the act in reference to ver. 7.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1, exhibiting Samuel in deep grief for Saul, connects itself immediately with xv. 35. We find him here in the same sorrow in which we left him. *Samuel mourned* for Saul in view of the great *gifts of grace* which he had received, but had nullified and lost by his disobedience and impenitence, in view of the *Lord's honor*, which he had violated, and in view of the *people*, for whom he had by his conduct turned God's blessing into a curse. Samuel's grief was an expression of the same love which drove him to intercession for Saul and at the same time filled him with holy anger (xv. 11). It was sorrow for Saul's rejection, but there was not (Brenz, Tremellius) connected with it prayer for the restoration of Saul to his former relation to God and for the renewal of his kingdom, of which nothing is said.—The question: **How long?** contains a divine *reproof*, indicating (so the words: "seeing I have rejected him from being king over Israel") that Samuel by his deep, long-continued grief over Saul's condition (a lamentable one under all circumstances and evermore) was out of sympathy with God and God's decrees and ways, which are clearly announced in these words and in xv. 35. Calvin: "The excellent prophet here displays something of human weakness. Samuel here looked on a vessel made by the invisible hand of God Himself utterly broken and minished, and his emotion thereat shows his pious and holy affection,—yet he is not without sin; not at all that the feeling is evil, but because it is excessive." From his *own* sad thoughts and feelings Samuel is directed through the Spirit of the Lord to the thoughts and the will of the Lord in respect to the Theocracy, as organ of which Saul is rejected. [Comp. the similar dealing with Elijah, 1 Ki. xix.—Tr.]. The Lord commands him to enter into His ways, which are to lead to the choice and consecration of another as instrument of the royal authority of God over His people. The divine command is: **Go and anoint one of the sons of Jesse the Bethlehemite, whom I have chosen to be king over Israel.**—This command presupposes an exact acquaintance on Samuel's part with Jesse and his house, and the presence in his family of the conditions necessary for the theocratic kingdom. That the family was a *wealthy* one is certain from ver. 11. That true *godliness* and piety reigned in it appears from Samuel's acquaintance and intercourse with it, and the sacrifice which he held in the house.—Ver. 2. Heretofore Samuel had grieved for Saul—now he fears him: **How can I go? if Saul hear it he will slay me.**—This protest against the plain direction of the voice of God rests naturally on the fact that Saul was still, notwithstanding the divine sentence of rejection, rightful king of Israel, and would regard the designation of another to the office (if it could not be kept concealed from him) as an act of treachery and revolt, even though Samuel should plead the divine command in his justification. "He will kill me,"—to explain these words, therefore, we need not suppose that the evil spirit had already driven Saul to madness. Even if that were the case, Saul might in his seasons of quiet also resolve to slay the betrayer of the kingdom.—This fear of Samuel is overborne by inspired direction as to what he is to do to conceal the act; he is to go to hold a sacrificial feast, and so announce himself. This divine command supposes that Samuel did not confine his circuits to certain holy places (vii. 16) where the people appeared in large numbers, but visited other places to hold public divine service, and that Jesse consequently could not be surprised at his appearing in Bethlehem for such a purpose. *Berl. Bib.*: "People must have been accustomed to Samuel's coming to this place and the other to sacrifice, which was very proper for a prophet, especially at the time when Shiloh was desecrated." This throws a new light on Samuel's combination of priestly work with prophetical.—No shade of untruthfulness rests on this command. As Saul's anointing (x. 16) was concealed, so David's anointing also is, according to the divine will, yet to remain a *secret*. Samuel was to keep this secret. Its concealment behind the sacrifice was not a lie.* Calvin: "It is to be observed that he practiced no simulation, but said what was true, namely, that he had come to sacrifice; but he put fraud on no one, he deceived no one, he

* [On the obvious political reason for this secrecy see *Bib. Comm.* and Wordsworth *in loco*.—Tr.]

used no bad arts, but conformed to the divine command, because it was not meet to publish God's design, when as yet God wished it to be concealed;—here lurked no falsehood, and the end was good, unconnected with fraud or treachery, but God wished David's anointing to be carefully kept as a secret deposit, so to speak, and a pledge."—Ver. 3. The performance of the divine commission in the sacrificial feast. *Three directions* are to be distinguished: 1) Samuel is to invite Jesse to the *sacrificial meal;* it is a slain-offering (זֶבַח) that is spoken of, with which was connected a feast; he is to be associated with Jesse in the feast in the narrower circle of the family. "Call in the sacrifice" is *construct. prœgn.* for "call to take part in the sacrifice;" 2) Samuel is to await *direction from above.* "I will tell thee what thou shalt do." This exhibits the specifically divine factor (of which Samuel is to be organ) in the choice of the new king of Israel; 3) He is to *anoint* as king him whom God shall name.—Ver. 4. **And Samuel did,** *etc.* The troubled condition of soul which could not accept God's thoughts and ways disappeared before the strict *obedience* of the will, which bowed before the Lord's will. **The elders of Bethlehem came tremblingly to meet him with the question: Comest thou in peace?** (The *Sing.* וַיֹּאמֶר "said," because one spoke in the name of all. Comp. Judg. viii. 6; Num. xxxii. 25). *This question* does not mean "Has a *misfortune* occurred, as the cause of thy coming?" nor does it express fear of punishment for some special misdoing (in the pillaging) in the Amalekite war, but it is the involuntary utterance of the fear which Samuel's sudden, unexpected appearance produced; for though he no longer formally held the office of judge, he yet appeared here and there (as formerly in his judicial circuits) to make unexpected visitation and exercise his watch-office as prophet. On such occasions it was his principal care to administer earnest rebuke, and to remove the evil that he found. To this refers the fright of the elders at meeting him, and the question whether he came in peace or *for good?*—Ver. 5. He answers the question in the *affirmative* and so quiets the Bethlehemites, declares the purpose of his coming to be to institute a sacrifice for the people of Bethlehem, and directs them *to sanctify themselves* and take part with him in the *sacrifice.* The "*sanctifying*" means the consecration of the person to the service of God by washing the body and putting on clean garments as symbol of the cleansing of the soul for communion with the holy God. Comp. Gen. xxxv. 2; Ex. xix. 10, 22. (The same pregnant construction here as in ver. 3). While directing the elders to take part in the offering, Samuel gives a special invitation to Jesse and his sons (by the same direction, to sanctify themselves) to partake of the sacrificial meal with him. [It is to be observed that the Heb. text here makes no difference between the invitation to Jesse's family and the general invitation to the elders. The Sept. and the Chald. make the former refer to the sacrifice and the latter to the sacrificial meal. It seems that there was a special meeting with Jesse and his sons, but it is not so stated in the text. After ver. 5, indeed, nothing more is said of the sacrifice, the narrative taking this for granted, and going on to the main occurrence.—Tr.].—After the ark was removed from the Tabernacle and Shiloh had thus ceased to be the place of worship and sacrifice for Israel, there were several places where altars for sacrifices were erected. The offering of the sacrifice is here to be put after ver. 5, and not (Then.) after the words "in the midst of his brethren" ver. 13, for the "coming" in ver. 6 refers to the feast, as appears from the words in ver. 11, "we will not sit down," and from the general connection. Samuel *thought* (lit., said) that Jesse's eldest son, *Eliab*, was surely **the Lord's anointed.**—Ver. 7. The difference is sharply stated between the divine thoughts and human judgment according to human standards. The *voice of God* inwardly teaches Samuel *two* things: 1) in respect of Eliab's person, he is not to infer from his imposing exterior that he was the chosen of the Lord. With this humbling correction, which connects itself with vers. 1, 2, he is taught 2) a general truth respecting the difference between divine and human modes of thought and judgment: *Not what man sees*—to which we must supply the words "sees the Lord." This ellipsis is not so hard as to require us to suppose (Then.) that these words have fallen out of the text. The thought naturally fills itself out from what precedes. The ground of the truth, that *human judgment and divine judgment are not the same* but different, is now declared.—**For man looks on the eyes, but the Lord looks on the heart,** that is, man judges according to the outward appearance,—the expression "the eyes" is not (with Sept.) to be exchanged for "countenance," but to be retained as signifying the outward appearance, which concentrates itself in the eyes, in contrast with the *heart* or the centre of the inner life, whence springs man's will and his whole spiritual frame. Not according to the agreeable appearance which commends itself to the eyes, but according to the moral worth hidden in the depths of the heart, according to the disposition of soul that pleases Him does the Lord judge, who proveth the heart and the reins.*—Ver. 8. The same decision is announced with reference to the second son, Abinadab. And so ver. 9 as to the third, Shammah. Thus Jesse made seven of his sons pass before Samuel. But Samuel's decision, according to the voice of God within him, is always negative. The "he said" in vers. 8 and 9 refers to Samuel, and = "he thought." We are, therefore, not thence to suppose that Samuel had communicated to Jesse the object of his mission. It is not till ver. 10 that the words "to Jesse" are added, expressly indicating an address of Samuel *to him:* **the Lord hath not chosen these.** It does not, however, follow, even from these words, that Samuel made Jesse a sharer in the divine secret. According to the following narrative none of the family (David's father and brothers), know anything of David's high destiny. That address to Jesse is merely a negative declaration that the divine selection, with which Samuel was concerned, and which in the absence of express intimation of its nature, might refer to the prophetic office, rested on none of these seven sons. Samuel's word was by reason of its indefiniteness a

* [See Ps. vii. 9; 1 Chr. xxviii. 9; Luke xvi. 15.—Tr.]

riddle, whose solution Jesse was to attain only from the following development of the history of his youngest son.—Ver. 11. To Samuel's question whether these are all the young men, Jesse answers that the youngest yet remains.* The prophet of the Lord is not satisfied with the presentation of the seven sons; he bids the father send for the youngest, before they sit down to the sacrificial meal. נָסֹב = "we will not surround," namely, the table, we will not sit around it to eat till he come. So De Wette, Ewald, Maurer. The explanation: "we will not *turn about*, namely, to proceed to something else, but will remain here waiting" (Then., Bött.) does not suit the situation as given by the context.—Ver. 12. David's appearance, *ruddy*, of the color of the hair, red hair being regarded in the East (as contrasting with the usual black color) as especially beautiful. עִם (as xvii. 42; Eccles. ii. 16) used adverbially = "at the same time," "*withal;*" *beautiful of eyes* and *good*, pleasing *in appearance*. In this youngest son were united the beauty of the oldest, and that which is well-pleasing to the Lord, what "the Lord looks on," a heart and mind after the will and good pleasure of the Lord (ver. 7). And so the divine decision is announced to Samuel: **Arise, anoint him, for this is he.** He is thus freed from all doubts and suspicions. Sure of his course, Samuel (ver. 13) performs the ceremony of anointing David (the object and meaning of the act being still an enigma to Jesse and his other sons) *in the midst of his brethren* or *from among* [Germ. *unter*] his brethren; the Heb. preposition (בְּקֶרֶב) may mean either. Thenius adopts the latter on the ground that the brothers had gone away, but this is not required by the narrative. Samuel's words in the second half of ver. 11 rather imply that they were all there. [Abarbanel and Philippson also adopt this view of the word, "among" his brethren, that is, "he alone of his brethren," because this better explains their after ignorance.—Tr.]. In any case the special significance, which God designed this anointing to have, was hidden from them. Anointing was always a symbol of the divine impartation of the Spirit from above on the Anointed. The impartation began immediately for David: **The Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward.**—This could not have happened, if the religious-ethical conditions had not been present in David's *heart*. This impartation of the Spirit was (along with the general gift of the divine Spirit) the special endowment with gifts and powers for the special theocratic royal calling, to which David was chosen and consecrated by this anointing according to divine decree and will. The word "from that day forward" denotes the continuity of the impartation of the Spirit to David's inner life, and indicates its unbroken development under the guidance of the divine Spirit to full fitness and capacity for the royal calling. Keil properly calls attention to the fact that nothing is here said of any explanatory word of Samuel touching this point, as in Saul's anointing, chap. x. 1. Whether David was now informed by Samuel of the meaning of the act is uncertain. Most probably he was not informed, since it was performed in the presence of the brothers, and its object was (according to the will of God) to remain concealed from them and the people. [It seems likely that a royal destiny for David would be the last thing in the minds of his brothers, for his higher intellectual and spiritual gifts were apparently at this time unknown to them. Gradually the course of events led them and the people (so Abigail xxv. 30) and probably Saul (xxiii. 17) to look on David as Saul's successor, and David would receive intimations concerning his destiny from Samuel. There is, therefore, no serious difficulty in understanding the silence of the brothers in the succeeding history.—Tr]. **Samuel went to Ramah.** That David was in constant communication with him (and perhaps with the prophetic school there) is quite certain from the following history. Comp. xix., xx. sq. In this intercourse with the prophet of the Lord he learned the meaning of Samuel s enigmatical act, and, under the progressive occupation and enlightenment of his inner life by the Spirit from above, received the knowledge of the duties of his royal calling and the preparation to fulfill them. For the present his election and anointing to be king of Israel remained a divine secret.

* [In 1 Chr. ii. 13-15 only seven sons of Jesse are mentioned; one may have died in youth. The Syr. and Arab. write Elihu (1 Chr. xxvii. 18) as seventh and David as eighth.—Tr.]

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The affairs of the kingdom of God go their way without break or halt according to God's high thoughts and decrees, though human sin and its attendant judgment (as in Saul's case), or human weakness (as in Samuel's immediate grief for Saul) may seem to hinder the plans of the divine wisdom. "In the history of Israel the concealing curtain of human purpose and action is lifted, and the thus unveiled, all-moving and all-guiding hand of Him of whom it is written, 'He worketh all things according to the counsel of his own will' (Eph. i. 11), appears therein" (F. W. Krummacher, *David*, p. 1). But it is also precisely by human sin and foolishness that the history of God's kingdom under the guidance of the divine wisdom and providence receives new occasions and impulses to wider and higher development according to the aims which God sets before Himself.

2. Samuel's grief for Saul, transgressing the bounds set by God and thus displeasing to Him, is easily explicable psychologically not merely from natural human feeling, but also from Samuel's theocratic calling and prophetic official interest. Considered from this point of view also it is not in conflict with Samuel's immovable prophetic opposition to Saul and his sentence of rejection, but is at the same time the most striking refutation of the false conception of Samuel's relation to Saul in this prophetic-judicial bearing towards him, which makes the latter a pitiable sacrifice to priestly jealousy and one-sidedness (see the literature in Winer, to which is to be added M. Dunker, *Geschichte des Alterthums* I.).

3. The concealing of the truth, when there is no design to deceive, when its utterance is required by no duty, and when the interests of the moral order of the world and of the kingdom of God are

in no wise injured, is far from being untruthfulness, much less falsehood; it is rather duty and obedience to the divine will.

4. The *beginnings* of David's theocratic life, as they present themselves in his election and calling to be king of Israel, have their *roots* (when we look back in the light of the divine history of revelation) in the consecrated ground of a family in Judah distinguished in history for piety and godliness, which belonged with its traditions to the shepherd-city of Bethlehem. The family whence Jesse sprang was from the beginning one of the most prominent in the tribe of Judah. One of its ancestors, Nahshon, stood at the head of the whole tribe in the march through the wilderness (Ruth iv. 20; Num. i. 7; ii. 3). "How remarkably the noblest and loveliest theocratic piety was nourished in this family, even in the degenerate times of the Judges, appears in the history of Ruth and Boaz; the latter a type of theocratic integrity, the former a truly consecrated flower of heathendom turning longingly to the light of divine revelation in Israel" (Kurtz in *Herz.* III., 299). Jesse, the son of Obed, was the grandson of this Boaz. His intimacy with Samuel speaks for his piety and that of his family. David was the noblest scion of this family, far excelling his brothers (vers. 7, 10) in heart-piety and theocratic feeling. His posture of heart, which stood the divine test and was well-pleasing to God, was the fruit of the piety of his father's house, whence sprang the humble, consecrated disposition* in which, after his anointing, he ripened more and more in soul under the guidance of God's Spirit to his high calling of theocratic royalty, coming by manifold experiences to a constantly clearer knowledge of this calling, and so guided by the Lord that not only the riddle of his dumb consecration was ever approaching solution, but also "from the course of events (connected with Samuel's former words to Saul) others, as Jonathan, and even Abigail, concluded that David was destined to be king, xxiii. 17; xx. 30" (v. Gerl.).—But also, when we look forward in the light of divine revelation, the early part of David's consecrated life contains many typical elements as factual prophecies or prefigurations of the future. His shepherd-life,† continued after he was anointed, in which *on the one hand* self-consecrated he immerses himself in the contemplation of God's revelation in nature and in His word, and *on the other hand* must be ready at any moment to meet the greatest dangers and exhibit boldness and prowess (xvii. 34–37), presents on these two sides types of his religious life as king, the Spirit of God developing on the basis of this double natural ground two sides of his character, which not merely co-exist, but are interwoven with each other: 1) *intensively* the innermost concentration and immersion of his thoughtful, meditative heart into the depths of God's revelation of His power, grace, and wisdom in nature, word, history, and into the depths of the sinful human heart, whence sprang in his psalms partly the inspired praise of God with furtherance and deepening in every direction of the knowledge of God, partly advance in the knowledge of the natural grace-lacking condition of the human heart; 2) *extensively* his admirable energy and heroic courage in the life of conflict, which he had evermore to lead. In the hiddenness of his royal calling from the people, the gradual ripening of his inner life for his office and the lowliness of the sphere whence he was raised to the throne, he is a type of Christ who, sprung from him according to the flesh, and by the prophets called "Son of David" and "Sprout of Jesse" (Isa. xi. 1, 10), passes his holy youth in privacy, gradually develops therein for his Messianic calling, and then at the end of this divine-human development steps forth from the lowliness of a natural-human life as the king of Israel, who completes in his person and work God's revelations for the establishment of His kingdom on earth, and therein enters on the war of subjugation against the ungodly world. From David's quiet anointing in the modest family-circle at Bethlelem to be King David, up to the birth, in the obscurity of a stall at Bethlehem, of the "Son of David," the "King of the Jews," there is an unbroken series of divine revelations, the beginning and end of which are bound together by the descent of the Saviour of the world from the Tribe of *Judah* "according to the flesh." And as *heathendom* entered the principal line of the tribe of Judah (whence came Jesse's house and David) in three distinguished women,* thus sharing in the derivation of the Messiah from Jesse's family,—and so the impulse implanted (by the fundamental blessing, Gen. xii. 3) in the seed of Abraham towards union with heathendom, which takes mostly a thoroughly perverted direction in all Israel's early history, showed itself in this family (consciously or unconsciously) in a normal and truly theocratic way—so we see, at the end of this development of the kingdom of God in Israel which goes from Bethlehem to Bethlehem, heathendom approaching in Bethlehem the new-born king of the Jews (having a natural right in Him because of its natural God-ordained share in His incarnation) in order to pay Him its homage. [This last statement expresses a parallelism, not a typical relation. That certain heathen women accepted the God of Israel, and that certain heathen astronomers believed in the divinely-sent king of the Jews are both facts illustrative of the promise to Abraham, but we cannot call them type and antitype, since they express not an essential principle, but a concomitant phenomenon of the fact of redemption. So the numerous cases in which God raised His servants from low to high position (as in David's life) are illustrations of a mode of divine action, and thus parallel to our Lord's history, but the relation of the events in the Old and New Covenants is not that of type and antitype, since they express an incidental and not an essential spiritual principle. David, as prophet and king, is a type of the true prophet and king, and his experiences as a spiritual-minded man answer to the experiences of the man

* [That is to say, the instruction and example of his father's house was God's means of developing this disposition in him. Piety is never inherited, but is always the direct creation of the Holy Spirit of God (John iii. 6).—Tr.]

† [The care of the flocks, perhaps an honorable occupation in earlier times (Jacob, Moses), was in later times usually given to inferiors, as servants and younger children.—Tr.]

* [Tamar (Gen. xxxviii.), Rahab (Matt. i. 5), Ruth (Ruth iv. 13), to which some add Bathsheba (or, Bathshua), but this is uncertain.—Tr.]

Jesus; but we cannot apply the term typical (without an unworthy lowering of its meaning) to all the outward resemblances between their lives.—Tr.]

5. The word: "Man looks on the eyes, God looks on *the heart*," like that other: "*Obedience* is better than sacrifice" (xv. 22) refers to the right *condition of heart* in a truly pious, humble disposition towards God the Lord. As we see clearly the difference between God's *word* and man's, between God's *thoughts* and man's, when Samuel says to himself "this or that one is the chosen one," and the Spirit from above says to his heart "no," and points him to one of whom he had not thought,—so we see according to their different standards the difference between divine and human *judgment*. The natural man judges according to the outward and visible; God, who proves and knows the heart and the reins (Ps. cxxxix. 1, 2; xliv. 22 [21]), judges according to the character of the heart and the direction of the will, according to the disposition of soul.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1. Berlenb. Bible: We may indeed have compassion upon every one who is wretched because of his sin; but when God's rejection is seen in continual hardening, that man must be given over to God's righteous judgment.—God demands in the souls He sets apart for Himself and for the guidance of others, such a dying to all things, that He does not allow them to regard any other interest than His, whatever reason may be alleged.—Schlier: The Lord reproves Samuel, who had indeed meant well, but had not thought rightly; even a Samuel had to subject himself to God's will, and with his whole mind and life send himself forward in God's ways. —Ver. 2 sqq. Starke: Faint-heartedness and feebleness is found even in the best saints, Matt. viii. 26.—[Henry: From this it appears 1. That Saul was grown very wicked. 2. That Samuel's faith was not very strong.—Tr.]—S. Schmid: In doubtful, trying and perilous circumstances it is best to ask God for counsel.—Cramer: A wise man is silent until he sees his time; but a fool cannot wait for the time, Eccl. xx. 7; Eccl. iii. 7; Gen. xxxvii.; Jud. xvi. 16.—J. Lange: There is a great difference between an untruth, when one says what is false, and silence, when one prudently keeps to himself what it is not necessary for others to know, x. 15, 16.—[We are not bound to tell *everything* unless we profess to be so doing, or the person asking has such peculiar relations to us as to warrant his expecting it. From failing to distinguish between deception and concealment, some persons condemn concealment and many justify deception. See an excellent discussion, with particular reference to this passage, in Thornwell's "*Discourses on Truth.*"—Tr.]—Berl. Bible: Samuel speaks the truth, though he does not speak all the truth, but partly conceals and partly reveals, according to his present design.—Ver. 5. J. Lange: So too the worthy appropriation of the atonement of Christ unto salvation must, according to the evangelical covenant of grace, be made with real inner purification, Isa. i. 16.—Ver. 6. S. Schmid: Human wisdom, however great, may yet be easily deceived accordingly even the wisest men must take care not to be too hasty in deciding.—Ver. 7. Cramer: God looks not at the outward work, but at the heart, and judges according to what His eyes see, Isa. xi. 3; Acts x. 34.—Berl. Bible: Men decide only according to the appearance, and so are commonly deceived; but the Lord looks to the depths of the heart, its most delicate movements, and our character, which is all clear to Him, and better known than we are to ourselves, Ps. vii. 10; cxxxix.; Heb. iv. 12, 13.—True, deep-grounded humility of heart is the only "appearance" in man that pleases God (Isa. lvii. 15); to this He looks as the ground of all virtues, for in it His fear has place. But where there is hidden pride, the fear of God is easily neglected.—[W. M. Taylor: We must not undervalue attention to the symmetrical discipline of the physical frame. Yet muscularity is not Christianity, and bodily beauty is not holiness. The character, therefore, ought to be the principal object of attention.—Tr.]—Osiander: Christians too must not be judged by the outward walk, since commonly, through the infirmities of their flesh, they have a bad appearance, while hypocrites, on the contrary, make a good show in their life, 2 Tim. iii. 5; Matt. vii. 15; Rom. ii. 20.—[This is true as regards a mere plausible exterior; but Christians *should* be judged by their *actions*, Matt. vii. 20.—Tr.]—Ver. 9 sqq. S. Schmid: God knows how to try, often and long, the patience of believers to their good, that He may confirm them in their faith and patience.—Ver. 11. God is wont to exalt the lowly, that they may always remember their lowliness, and not be proud, but glory only in God who has exalted them, 1 Cor. i. 27 sqq., 31. [Scott: Nor does He favor our children according to our fond partialities; but often most honors and blesses those who have been the least regarded.—Tr.]—Ver. 13. Cramer: Christians are temples and dwellings of the Holy Ghost, 2 Cor. vi. 19.—S. Schmid: When we have done our duty as commanded by God, we have to leave the rest to God's government, Matt. x. 23.

Vers. 1–13. F. W. Krummacher: *Call and anointing* of the shepherd-youth: 1) By what this was occasioned, 2) How it was performed.—[Ver. 7. Henry: "The Lord looketh on the heart." 1. He knows the heart. 2. He judges of men by the heart.—Tr.]—J. Disselhoff (*The History of King David*, 14 sermons): *The secret of the choice:* 1) The Lord does not choose those who by peculiar gifts of nature are distinguished above others, but 2) He chooses those who faithfully profit by the greater or less measure of God's grace which is granted them, 3) Who show this faithfulness by pure zeal and obedience in the labor entrusted to them, and 4) Those who even after some success in their labor do not boastfully press themselves forward, but remain in silent humility and quiet seclusion till the Lord brings them forth.

[Ver. 1. *Remedies for improper mourning:* 1) Submission to the will of God ("I have rejected him"); 2) Diligence in present work for God ("fill thy horn and go"); 3) Hope that God will bring a better future ("I have provided me a king").—Ver. 4. Why do men so shrink from religious teachers?—Vers. 6–12. *Difficulty of selecting men for important positions:* 1) Causes: *a*)

Intrinsic difficulty of properly estimating character. *b*) Management of partial friends. 2) Lessons: *a*) To avoid haste in deciding. *b*) To make diligent inquiries. *c*) To seek special Divine guidance.—Ver. 12. *The youth of David.* Handsome, energetic, brave, talented and accomplished, of good family, devout—faithfully pursuing an humble calling which developed manliness, and trusting God for the unknown future—O the glorious possibilities of youth! (Comp. Kitto, "*Saul and David*," p. 197 sqq., Maurice, "*Prophets and Kings*," p. 38 sq.)—Tr.]

II. *The Darkening of Saul's Mind by the Evil Spirit, and David's First Appearance at the Court of Saul as Harpist.*

Vers. 14–23.

14 But [And] the Spirit of the Lord [Jehovah] departed from Saul, and an evil
15 spirit from the Lord [Jehovah] troubled him. And Saul's servants said unto him,
16 Behold now, an evil spirit from God[1] troubleth thee. Let our lord now command
—— thy servants *which* [*om.* which] are before thee, to [and let them, *or* they will]
seek out[2] a man who is a cunning player[3] on a [the] harp; and it shall come to pass,
when the evil spirit from God is upon thee, that he shall play with his hand, and
17 thou shalt be well. And Saul said unto his servants, Provide me now a man that
18 can play well,[4] and bring him to me. Then answered one of the servants [And
one of the young men answered] and said, Behold I have seen a son of Jesse the
Bethlehemite, that is cunning in playing[4] and a mighty valiant man and a man of
war and prudent in matters[5] and a comely person, and the Lord [Jehovah] is with
19 him. Wherefore [And] Saul sent messengers unto Jesse, and said, Send [*ins.* to]
20 me David thy son, which is with the sheep. And Jesse took an ass[6] *laden with*
bread, and a bottle [skin] of wine, and a kid,[7] and sent them by David his son
21 unto Saul. And David came to Saul, and stood before him, and he loved him
22 greatly, and he became his armor-bearer. And Saul sent to Jesse, saying, Let
23 David, I pray thee, stand before me, for he hath found favor in my sight. And
it came to pass, when the *evil*[8] spirit from God was upon Saul, that David took an
[the] harp, and played with his hand, so [and] Saul was refreshed, and was well,
and the evil spirit departed from him.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

1 [Ver. 15. The Heb. text here uniformly designates the source of righteous influence as "the Spirit of Jehovah," and the source of evil influence as "evil spirit," "evil spirit of God," or "evil spirit from Jehovah," the significance of the last preposition being obvious; except in ver. 23, where it is "spirit of God," and Sept., Chald., Syr., Arab. and Eng. A. V. there insert "evil;" in xix. 9 it is "evil spirit of Jehovah," and there Sept. writes "God," instead of Jehovah, Chald. and Eng. A. V. insert "from" before "Jehovah," and Arab. omits the divine name. Elsewhere throughout the Old Testament the Divine Spirit is called either "Spirit of God" or "Spirit of Jehovah."—Tr.]

2 [Ver. 16. This clause is difficult in the Heb., and varies in the ancient VSS. Chald. follows the Heb.; Sept. takes עֲבָדֶיךָ as subject, omits אֲדֹנֵנוּ, and renders: "let thy servants now say before thee and seek," where "say" for "speak" is not tolerable (we should expect דבר instead of אמר); Vulg.: "let our lord command, and thy servants who are before thee will seek," where לְפָנֶיךָ is made to qualify "servants" (so in Eng. A. V.), contrary to usage, which demands that it stand after a verbal conception; Syr. omits the speech of the servants in ver. 15, and goes on in ver. 16: "thy servants are before thee, let them seek." As the Heb. now stands, the words עב׳ לפ׳ must form a separate clause; but the construction is thus harsh. If we could omit לפ׳ (which, however, is sustained by all the VSS.), an easy reading would be given: "let our lord now command, and thy servants will seek."—The use of the second pers. suffix when the verb is in the third pers., though not the usual construction, occurs elsewhere, as 2 Sam. xiv. 11.—Tr.]

3 [Ver. 16. The partcp. as complement of the verb "to know." See Ew., *Gr.* § 285, *a*, and Ges. § 142, 4.—Tr.]

4 [Vers. 17 and 18. Infin. as complement, Ges. § 142.—Tr.]

5 [Ver. 18. Or, "in speech," as in margin of Eng. A. V.; but "affairs" seems to suit the connection better. Chald. "counsel," Vulg., Syr. and Erdmann "word." In Isa. iii. 3 לחשׁ is "enchantment," though the phrase is rendered by Jewish commentators "clever in discourse" (Philippson). Comp. 1 Sam. xviii. 14.—Tr.]

6 [Ver. 20. Sept. "omer" or "homer" (*γομόρ*), on which Wellh. rightly says that bread was not reckoned by measure; he proposes to read a numeral here instead of חֲמוֹר, since bread was usually counted by loaves. But we may follow the ancient VSS., which render "ass-load of bread."—Tr.]

7 [Ver. 20. Fully: "a kid of the goats."—Tr.]

8 [Ver. 23. See note 1 on ver. 15.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 15. Observe the sharp contrast between the statement in ver. 13: "the Spirit of the Lord came upon David," and that which here immediately follows: **The Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul.**—The Spirit is meant which Saul received in consequence of his anointing, and by which he became *another man*, that is, a man full of great royal thoughts, courage of faith and inspiration. The *cause* of the departure of the divine Spirit from him, as given in the narrative, was his *rejection* by the Lord, and his persistent, impenitent *pride* and *disobedience* of heart towards the Lord.—*Berl. Bib.*: "No doubt Saul took his rejection to heart, and, instead of yielding humbly to God's righteous judgment and bowing beneath God's mighty hand, gave himself up to displeasure and discontent at God's holy ways, and was therefore given over to the power of an evil spirit, which vexed him and sometimes even drove him to madness."—**And an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him**; literally, fell upon him and frightened him (בִּעֲתָ), Ps. xviii. 5. The narrator means to describe Saul's condition as one of anxiety and terror, which was produced in him by an *evil spirit*. This spirit (called in ver. 23 also *the evil spirit*), is, according to the narrative, not the condition itself of gloomy melancholy and torturing anguish, but an objective power, which produced it. It is a wicked spiritual power, which came upon him as the opposite of the good, holy spirit which he had once possessed, and goaded him to rage and madness (xviii. 10, 11), finding its occasion in the conflict within his soul and in the passionateness of his nature, which, after the Spirit of the Lord left him, was unbridled. It came on Saul *from the Lord;* that is, the Lord gave him over to the power and might of this spirit as punishment for his disobedience and defiant self-will; for this reason this spirit is called in vers. 15, 16 "an evil spirit of God," and in ver. 23 simply "a spirit of God;" that is, one that came from God. [It seems clear that the evil spirit here cannot be resolved into simple melancholy without doing violence to the narrative (so the demons of the N. T.). Reasons for melancholy and madness may be found in Saul's life and character (see the pathological and psychological aspects of his case treated by Kitto, Maurice, Krummacher, Ewald, and others), but over and above these the narrative speaks, as Erdmann says, of an objective spiritual wicked power, which had strange control over him. This possession by the spirit was in accordance with psychological conditions, yet distinct from them, and was controlled by the almighty God of Israel. We have here the proof of the belief in evil spirits by the Israelites many centuries before the exile, a belief very general, no doubt, though not as fully developed here as in "Job."—Tr.]—The servants of Saul speak of this cause of his mental condition in order (ver. 16) to counsel him to let them find a skilful harpist, that he may be healed by the strains of music of his suffering of soul. Saul having commanded this (ver. 17), one of the young men of the court (ver. 18) mentioned the son of Jesse, whom he himself knew. In order to induce Saul to call him to court, he describes him at length, as not merely a harpist, but also what would especially recommend him to Saul, a *valiant man*, a *man of war*, an *eloquent man* [or *prudent*—Tr.], a *comely person, with whom the Lord is.* All these characteristics appear clearly in David's history; their combination in this description shows that the young man was well acquainted with him. His beauty of person has already been mentioned in ver. 12. He had showed his bravery and warlike spirit, if not in battle, yet in conflict with ravenous beasts for his herd (xvii. 34 sq.) His piety and communion with the Lord, the culminating point of the description, has already been referred to in vers. 12, 13. His eloquence is a new feature and characterizes the future psalmist.—Ver. 19. The message to Jesse to send his son to court.—Ver. 20. Jesse is soon ready. He sends his son with presents appropriate to a herdsman and countryman. From this it appears that it was still customary to bring presents as a sign of obedience and subjection, see on x. 4. The Heb. text, in spite of its difficulty, is to be retained; render: *an ass laden with bread.* חֲמוֹר, not, as Sept., חֹמֶר, "since bread was not reckoned by measures" (Keil). Clericus: "an ass laden with bread, with a skin of wine and with a kid, so that David might have nothing to carry." Maur.: "an ass laden with bread," &c. Compare the *ἄρτων τρεῖς ὄνους* (= *τριῶν ὄνων φορτίον*) [three asses of bread = a load of three asses] of the tragic poet Sosibius.—Ver. 21. So David came to Saul and *stood before him;* that is, served him. Becoming fond of him, Saul retained him and placed him among his armor-bearers, entrusted him, therefore, with a military service, informing Jesse (ver. 22) that his son would remain with him.—Ver. 23. David's playing had the effect of *relieving*, freeing Saul from his suffering, so that he became *well* again; when he heard the music, the evil spirit departed from him. The power of musical sounds over Saul was such that his gloomy mood vanished. Many illustrations from heathen writers of the wholesome effect of music on the mind are given by Cleric., Grot., and Bochart, in the *Hieroz.*, p. I., 1, II., c. 44 (I., p. 511 sqq. ed. Rosenmüller). [Bochart also inquires whether David's songs to Saul were sacred or secular (see Browning's poem "*Saul*"), and how music had power over the evil spirit. See Kitto, "*Saul and David*," p. 202 sq.—On the nature of the instrument which David used, the harp, *kinnor*, see on x. 5, and the *Bib.-Dictionaries* and books on Archæology. Whether the kinnor was played with the hand or with a plectrum (either would suit the statement in ver. 23) is uncertain.—Tr.]

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. To be rejected by the Lord for continued disobedience and hardness of heart against the chastening and guidance of His Spirit, is identical with the departure from the heart of the Spirit of God, which can dwell and be efficient only where heart and will are turned to the light from above. But when the Spirit of God departs from the man, he is not simply left to himself, but, as Saul's example shows, his heart becomes the abode of the evil spirit. Theodoret: "Where the divine spirit departs, the wicked spirit comes in his place.

This should teach us to pray with David: Take not thy Holy Spirit from me." Man is governed either by the Spirit from above or by the spirit from beneath; there is no third course. For he is as little isolated in the invisible as in the visible world; he must be part of the organism of the one or the other of the invisible worlds; he belongs either to the kingdom of light or to the kingdom of darkness; he is guided either by the Spirit of the Lord or by the evil spirit, according as he decides for a permanent attitude of heart and direction of will to this side or that. But Saul's example teaches still more, namely, the divine causality in the position of the rejected man under the power of the evil spirit: He gives the apostate, reprobate man into the power of the evil spirit, permits the latter to control him; when man by continued conscious opposition to Him renders His Spirit inefficacious He righteously punishes him by giving him over to the evil spirit, who must serve God, and can do nothing except the Lord, who is almighty over all spirits, give him a field within the moral order of the world, in which, for the execution of His punitive justice, even the power of the evil one must be subservient to Him. Therefore the wicked spirit is here called a spirit "from the Lord." *—The consequence of the possession of the inner life by the evil spirit is not merely its sunderance and derangement (there being of necessity conflict partly between the divine nature of the soul and its indwelling ungodly inclinations and passions, and partly among these last themselves), but at the same time the filling of the heart with wicked thoughts, dark melancholy, and the spirit of hatred, the perversion and dedication of the natural noble gifts of the spirit and heart (so richly possessed by Saul) to the service of the kingdom of evil. But in all this there is presupposed as back-ground not a merely physical suffering, but a corresponding ethical determination of the inner life against God. "There is much suffering and melancholy which has its origin in purely bodily sickness; as soon as the sickness ceases, the melancholy also ceases. But there is also to-day much heaviness of mind, which has its ground in the kingdom of darkness" (Schlier.).†

2. The counter-picture to Saul, who is controlled by the evil spirit, is David, under the guidance and discipline of the Spirit of God from his anointment on. His divinely-bestowed natural gift of poetry and music is not merely sanctified and consecrated by the Spirit of the Lord, but also powerfully developed and intensified, and by the Lord's ordination taken into the service of His merciful love; for this love is seen in that He makes David's art alleviate Saul's sufferings, and in the depth of Saul's soul makes the chords of the godlike man resound in the demon-possessed nature and drown its tones. The power to set forth the Beautiful as the Harmonious in music is a natural gift of God's grace, which, employed in the service of sin and of the kingdom of darkness, robs music of its divine nobility and misuses it for the furtherance of the kingdom of evil in the human heart and in the world; but, on the other hand, (as in David's case), developed according to its God-implanted laws, and under the guiding discipline of God's Spirit, checks and expels the power of evil, rouses again the nobler feelings of human nature (created by and for God), and restores at least for a time the disturbed harmony of the life of the soul. David's harp playing before Saul is the prelude to the harpings and songs which flowed from the heart of the future royal singer.

3. With the beginning of his service at the court of Saul, David, under the wonderful guidance of God's hand, whence he had through Samuel received the royal anointing, enters on the path of inner and outer development till he ascends the throne. It was the way of external cultivation and preparation for the representative side of the kingdom by the experiences and knowledges which he gained at the royal court concerning all that pertained to the fulfilment of the royal calling, but also, what is far more important, a way of deep suffering, which must needs have served to try and tempt, but also to purify, prove and confirm him, and establish his inner life in communion with his God; from this school of suffering, whose experiences afterwards resound throughout his Psalms, he comes forth as a man who has been educated from shepherd-boy to king.

[*Helps in the study of David's life:* Chandler's *Life of David* (abounds in illustrations from classic antiquity, and is polemical against Bayle); Ewald's *History of Israel;* Stanley's *Jewish Church* (brilliant in description); Schlier's *Saul* and Krummacher's *David* (devotional); Stähelin's *David* (strictly scientific); F. D. Maurice, *Prophets and Kings of O. T.* (fresh and clear); Kitto's *Saul and David* (in *Daily Bib. Illust.*); W. M. Taylor's *David*, 1875 (excellent); Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden;* Apocrypha relating to David in Fabricius, *Codex Pseud. Vet. Test.*, Tom. I.; Legends concerning him in Koran, Suras ii., xxxviii.; Weil's *Biblical Legends of the Mussulmans;* Baring-Gould's *Legends of O. T. Characters.* See also Josephus, *Antiquities* VI. 8—VII. 15; Wilberforce's *Heroes of Hebrew History;* and Articles in the Dictionaries of Herzog, Smith, Fairbairn, and Ersch and Grube. Voltaire and Bayle deal with David's life in an unworthy spirit.—Tr.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 14. Calvin: As God grants His gifts richly to those who serve Him in the obedience of faith, so He withdraws them again from those who are slothful in employing them, that we may not believe God is under obligation to us. God does indeed distribute His gifts richly and abundantly, but He also demands from us the right use of them, that they may subserve *His* aims. Whoever, then, does not give back to God what He has received from Him, will certainly soon lose it.—Cramer: He who will not let himself be ruled by the Spirit of God, drives it out; and where that is driven out, there is no *third* state possible, but the evil spirit goes in again, Luke xi. 23 sq.—Vers. 15, 16. Schmid: We should have compassion even upon those who by their sins have

* [On the relation of the spiritual influence on Saul to the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit as taught in the N. T., see Hodge's *Theol.*, II., 660 sq. (especially 666).—Tr.]

† [On the possibility of demoniac possession at the present day, and on the general subject of the power of evil spirits in the ancient and modern world, see Mr. R. S. Poole's Art. "Magic" in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*—Tr.]

drawn on themselves God's chastisement, and should give them counsel as to how their case may be bettered.—[Ver. 18. David was a brave soldier and a famous musician. There is a very unwise notion abroad in America that to perform well on musical instruments is something *effeminate*. But the Hebrews thought not so, nor did the Greeks, nor do the Germans.—Tr.]—Ver. 19. Osiander: God gradually, more and more, draws His people forward and exalts them; yea, He leads them by degrees from one ground to another even unto eternal life.—Ver. 23. Cramer: Only God's word and believing prayer can drive out Satan with his assaults, Eph. vi. 17, 18.—Schlier: There is a wonderful power in song and the harp over the human heart; how much sorrow and anguish retreat before it—how much of the power of darkness is broken; where song and the harp dwell in the fear of God, there the power of evil spirits gives way, there the good spirits come, hell is silent, heaven comes down.—F. W. Krummacher: We ask, "Did the harmonies banish the demon?" No! But the higher mood into which the king was brought by them sufficed at least to give the affliction less room for working on his mind, while against a full, clearly conscious life of faith on Saul's part, the power of the evil spirit would have been utterly wrecked.—Schlier: Thoroughly better would it have been for him if he had been converted—if he had earnestly repented. But of repentance Saul would know nothing; he let himself be cheered, but he would not turn about. If our sins give to the kingdom of darkness power over us, then we must repent. He who chooses to persevere in sin and cannot acknowledge his guilt, should not wonder forsooth if he finds no peace. Evil conscience, evil guest. No peace, nor any rest! But the word stands fast forever that the Lord makes the upright to prosper.—Wuert. Summary: The mourning of this world and the heaviness proceeding from an evil conscience can be relieved by no harping nor any diversion, if forgiveness of sins is not earnestly sought and gained, and the heart is not truly bettered.

Vers. 13–23. J. Disselhoff: *The anointing of the chosen one:* 1) Whom the Lord chooses for His servant, He causes before His work to be anointed with power from on high; 2) The anointing does not at once give the throne, but it first leads into lowliness; 3) The anointing does not annihilate natural gifts and powers, but sanctifies them and fits them for the service of the Lord.

Vers. 14–23. F. W. Krummacher: *The harper:* 1) How David *came* to Saul; 2) What he *experienced* at the king's court.

Ver. 14. *Man is under the dominion either of the holy or of the evil spirit:* 1) Statement of this *truth*. 2) Indication of the opposite *consequences* in the two cases. 3) Application of the solemn *warnings* therein contained.

[Ver. 21. "And he loved him greatly." 1) Saul, with all his faults, a *loving* man. Comp. xxiv. 16. 2) David an eminently *lovable* youth. Some of the qualities which made him such are indicated in ver. 18: handsome, accomplished, brave and soldierly, prudent, pious. (Highly creditable to a youth to gain the love of old men.) 3) The Lord loved David, and caused his fellowmen to love him. Vers. 13, 18. Comp. Gen. xxxix.

Vers. 17–22. *Example of the young harper David:* 1) Improvement of youthful leisure a preparation for the work of life. 2) Something in itself unimportant often the providential occasion of great results. But note: *a*) It can only be the *occasion;* the causes must together be as great as the effect. *b*) There must be disciplined character, or occasions will be in vain. 3) A youth leaving home for scenes of temptation is safe if "the Lord is with him." (Comp. W. M. Taylor, *David*, Sermon III.)

Robert Browning's finest poem is on "Saul," depicting his madness, and the effect of David's harp and song.—Tr.]

SECOND SECTION.

Saul's New War with the Philistines and David's Exploit with its Diverse Consequences for Him and for his Relation to Saul.

Chapters XVII.—XIX. 7.

I. *The two Camps and Goliath's arrogant Challenge.*

Chap. XVII. 1–11.

1 Now [And] the Philistines gathered together their armies to battle, and were
gathered together at Shochoh [Socoh], which belongeth to Judah, and pitched
2 between Shochoh [Socoh] and Azekah, in Ephes-dammim.[1] And Saul and the

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. This name is variously spelled in the VSS. Sept., Vat., Ἐφερμέν (omission of *s* and *r* for *d*), Aq. ἐν πέρατι Δομείμ, Syr. Opharsemin (for Ophasremin, a common mode of inversion in Syriac writing of proper names, and *r* for *d*), Arab. Pharsamin (after the Syriac), Vulg. *finibus Dommim* (confines of Dommim, a translation of the first part of the Heb. word). These readings establish the form in the text, which, however, appears in 1 Chron. xi. 13 as Pas-dammim (Sept. Φασοδαμίν, Syr. Pasi demayo [Pasi, or well of the waters], Vulg. Phesdomim, Arab. well of Bethlehem [after Syr.]), probably a shortened form of our word.—Tr.]

men of Israel were gathered together, and pitched by [in] the valley of Elah
3 [of the Terebinth], and set the battle in array against the Philistines. And
the Philistines stood on a [the] mountain on the one side, and Israel stood
on a [the] mountain on the other side, and there was a valley [the ravine
4 was] between them. And there went out a champion[2] out of [from] the camp
of the Philistines, named Goliath, of Gath, whose height was six cubits and
5 a span. And he had an helmet of brass [copper] upon his head, and he was armed
with [clothed in] a coat of mail [corselet of scales]; and the weight of the coat
6 [corselet] was five thousand shekels of brass [copper]. And he had greaves[3] of
brass [copper] upon his legs, and a target [javelin] of brass [copper] between his
7 shoulders. And the staff of his spear was like a weaver's beam, and his spear's
head[4] weighed six hundred shekels of iron; and one bearing a shield [the shield-
8 bearer] went before him. And he stood and cried unto the armies [ranks][5] of
Israel, and said unto them, Why are ye come out to set your battle in array? am
I not a [the] Philistine, and ye servants[6] to Saul? choose you a man for you, and
9 let him come down to me. If he be able to fight with me, and to [*om.* to] kill me,
then will we be your servants; but [and] if I prevail against him and kill him,
10 then shall ye be our servants and serve us. And the Philistine said, I defy the
armies [ranks] of Israel this day; give me a man that we may fight together.
11 When [And] Saul and all Israel heard these words of the Philistine, [*ins.* and]
they were dismayed and greatly afraid.

II. *David and Goliath.* Vers. 12–54.

12 Now [And] David was the son of that [this] Ephrathite of Bethlehem-Judah,
whose name was Jesse; and he had eight sons; and the man went among men for
an old man in the days of Saul [the man in the days of Saul was old, advanced in
13 years].[8] And the three eldest sons of Jesse went *and* followed [had followed][9]
Saul to the battle; and the names of his three sons that went to the battle were
14 Eliab, the first-born, and next unto him Abinadab, and the third Shammah. And
15 David was the youngest; and the three eldest followed Saul. But [And] David
16 went and returned from[10] Saul to feed his father's sheep at Bethlehem. And the
17 Philistine drew near morning and evening, and presented himself forty days. And
Jesse said unto David his son, Take now for thy brethren an ephah of this parched
corn, and these ten loaves, and run [carry them quickly] to the camp to thy breth-

[2] [Ver. 4. Chald. (misunderstanding the Heb., but serving to establish the text) "a man from between them," Syr. "giant." The Vulg. curiously renders "spurious," that is, according to explanations suggested in Poole's Synopsis, "giant," because giants were looked on as despising the laws of marriage, born of uncertain fathers, hence called "sons of the earth." The rendering "giant," "mighty man,"—"one distinguished among (בֵּין) men," or "a man of sons (בָּנִים)."—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 6. In the Heb. Sing., but according to all the ancient VSS. Plu.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 7. Literally "flame," from the flashing of the metal, Aq., Th., φλὸξ δόρατος.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 8. It seems better to express in the translation the distinction between "army" (צָבָא, חַיִל, מַחֲנֶה) and "ranks" (מַעֲרָכֹת).—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 8. Sept. writes badly "Hebrews," and omits Art. before "Philistine." "The phrase 'the Philistine' is conceived from the stand-point of the Jewish narrator" (Wellh.).—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 12. This word (הַזֶּה) is grammatically impracticable; it no doubt belongs to the original text, being the Redactor's reference to the preceding narrative, ch. xvi., and in order to indicate this reference in the translation, the word is rendered "this," instead of "that." It is retained in Chald., Vulg., Greek (οὗτος, impossibly), and omitted (on account of the difficulty) in Syr., Arab.—On the omission of vers. 12-31 in the Vat. Sept., see Erdmann in Introd. and Exposition.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 12. This corrected reading is adopted (from the Syriac) also by Maurer, Thenius, Wellhausen, and by Erdmann. Bib. Comm. prefers the reading of the Vulg.: "old and of a great age among men" (בא being taken elliptically for בא בשנים), which, however, is hardly defensible. The inversion of Eng. A. V. is not allowable. The Chald. has (in Jesse's honor): "the man in the days of Saul was old, counted among the choice young men." So in Talmud, Berakoth 58, 1, the explanation is: "he went forth with the army, and went in with the army, and taught in the army" (but Philippson renders: "he had a retinue"). These attempts all do violence to the text, which in its present form yields no good sense, but becomes natural and easy when we substitute שָׁנִים or יָמִים for אֲנָשִׁים. See Erdmann's Exposition.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 13. This construction is explained by the grammarians as pluperfect; yet its difficultness suggests an insertion of הָלְכוּ by clerical error, possibly from the following clause. At the same time this whole paragraph is marked by grammatical harshness, due to the connection which the Redactor keeps up with ch. xvi.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 15. Some MSS. have מֵעִם instead of מֵעַל, and one inserts בּ before "Bethlehem."—Tr.]

18 ren; And carry these ten cheeses [pieces of cheese[11]] unto the captain of their
thousand, and look how thy brethren fare, and take their pledge [and bring a
19 token[12] from them]. Now [And] Saul and they and all the men of Israel *were*[13]
20 in the valley of Elah [of the Terebinth], fighting with the Philistines. And David
rose up early in the morning, and left the sheep with a keeper, and took, and went,
as Jesse had commanded him, and he [*om.* he] came to the trench [wagon-rampart]
as [and] the host was going forth[14] to the fight and [*ins.* they] shouted for the bat-
21 tle. For [And] Israel and the Philistines had [*om.* had] put the battle in array
22 army against army [line against line]. And David left[15] his carriage [baggage]
in the hand of the keeper of the carriage [baggage], and ran into the army [ranks],
23 and came and saluted [asked after the welfare of] his brethren. And as he talked
with them, behold, there came up the champion, the Philistine of Gath, Goliath
by name [Goliath the Philistine by name, of Gath[16]], out of the armies [from the
ranks[17]] of the Philistines, and spake according to the same words; and David
24 heard them. And all the men of Israel, when they saw the man, fled from him,
25 and were sore afraid. And the men of Israel said, Have ye seen this man that is
come up? surely [for] to defy Israel is he come up; and it shall be that the man
who killeth him, the king will enrich[18] him with great riches, and will give him
26 his daughter, and make his father's house free in Israel. And David spake to the
men that stood by him, saying, What shall be done to the man that killeth this
Philistine, and taketh away the reproach from Israel? for who is this uncircum-
27 cised Philistine, that he should defy the armies [ranks] of the living God? And
the people answered him after this manner, saying, So shall it be done to the man
28 that killeth him. And Eliab, his eldest brother, heard when he spake unto the
men, and Eliab's anger was kindled against David, and he said, Why camest thou
down hither? and with whom hast thou left those few sheep in the wilderness? I
know thy pride and the naughtiness of thine heart; for thou art come down that
29 thou mightest see the battle (for to see the battle art thou come down). And
David said, What have I now done? Is there not a cause [Was it not a word
30 *merely*[19]]? And he turned from him toward another, and spake after the same
31 manner; and the people answered him again after the former manner. And when
[*om.* when] the words were heard which David spake, [*ins.* and] they rehearsed
them before Saul; and he sent for him.

32 And David said to Saul, Let no man's heart fail because of him; thy servant
33 will go and fight with this Philistine. And Saul said to David, Thou art not able
to go against this Philistine to fight with him, for thou art but a youth, and he a
34 man of war from his youth. And David said unto Saul, Thy servant kept his
father's sheep, and there came a [the] lion and a [the] bear,[20] and took a lamb[21]
35 out of the flock; And I went after him and smote him and delivered it out of his
mouth; and when he arose against me, I caught him by his beard,[22] and smote him
36 and slew him. Thy servant slew both the lion and the bear; and this uncircum-
cised Philistine shall be as one of them,[23] seeing he hath defied the armies [ranks]

[11] [Ver. 18. Properly "thick curds."—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 18. Aq. *σύμμιξιν* (intercourse), Sym. *μισθοφορίαν* (pay), Th. *ὁ ἐὰν χρῄζουσι*, Chald. "their welfare," Syr. "message."—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 19. Or, if this be a part of Jesse's speech, "are;" so Erdmann.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 20. The Art. is to be omitted before יֹצֵא, otherwise וְהֵחִיל, *etc.*, must be the Accus. after וַיָּבֹא, which gives an unnatural sense, and breaks the connection with וְהֵרֵעוּ.—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 22. The Heb. is more lively: "put his baggage from him upon the hand," *etc.*—Tr.]

[16] [Ver. 23. So the Heb. requires. The champion's name was "Goliath the Philistine."—Tr.]

[17] [Ver. 23. On the Kethib and Qeri see Erdmann, Exposition.—Tr.]

[18] [Ver. 25. The unusual Hiph. form (omission of chireq) is perhaps from assimilation to the preceding word, the doubled Nun depressing the pretonic syllable. Similar form in 1 Sam. xiv. 22.—Tr.]

[19] [Ver. 29. So also Erdmann, Philippson, *Bib. Com.*, and the ancient VSS.—Tr.]

[20] [Ver. 34. On the Art. and אֶת see the Exposition. Maurer proposes to render אֶת "with," equivalent to "and." So Kimchi and Junius in 2 Kings vi. 5.—Tr.]

[21] [Ver. 34. The זֶה for שֶׂה is a remarkable instance of a perpetuated clerical error. Norzi and De Rossi state that all MSS. and early Edd. read שֶׂה; but the Ed. of Athias has retained the erroneous form which is corrected by some other editors (as Walton).—Tr.]

[22] [Ver. 35. Sept. "throat;" other VSS. as Heb.—Tr.]

[23] [Ver. 36. Sept. here inserts: "shall I not go and smite him, and take away to-day the reproach from Israel?" so nearly the Vulg.—an insertion from ver. 26.—Tr.]

37 of the living God. David said moreover [And David said], The Lord [Jehovah]
that delivered me out of the paw [hand][24] of the lion and out of the paw [hand] of
the bear, he will deliver me out of the hand of the Philistine. And Saul said unto
38 David, Go, and the Lord [Jehovah] be[25] with thee. And Saul armed David with
his armor [clothed David with his military dress], and he [*om.* he] put an helmet[26]
of brass [copper] upon his head, also he [and] armed [clothed] him with a coat of
39 mail [corselet of scales]. And David girded his sword upon his armor [dress] and
he [*om.* he] assayed[27] to go, for he had not proved it. And David said unto Saul,
40 I cannot go with [in] these, for I have not proved them. And David put them
off him. And he took his staff in his hand, and chose him five smooth stones out
of the brook, and put them in [into] a [the] shepherd's bag[28] which he had, even
[namely] in [into] a [the] scrip;[28] and his sling was in his hand, and he drew near
to the Philistine.
41 And[29] the Philistine came on and drew near [the Philistine drew nearer and
42 nearer] unto David, and the man that bare the shield *went* before him. And when
[*om.* when] the Philistine looked about [*om.* about] and saw David, [*ins.* and] he
disdained him, for he was *but* [*om.* but] a youth and ruddy and of a fair counte-
43 nance.[30] And the Philistine said unto David, Am I a dog, that thou comest to
44 me with staves? And the Philistine cursed David by his gods. And the Philis-
tine said to David, Come to me, and I will give thy flesh unto [to] the fowls of
45 the air and to the beasts of the field.[31] Then said David [And David said] to the
Philistine, Thou comest to me with a [*om.* a] sword and with a [*om.* a] spear and
with a [*om.* a] shield [javelin], but I come to thee in the name of the Lord [Jeho-
vah] of hosts, the God of the armies [ranks] of Israel, whom thou hast defied.
46 This day will the Lord [Jehovah] deliver thee into my hand, and I will smite thee
and take thine head from thee, and I will give the carcasses[32] of the host [army]
of the Philistines this day unto [to] the fowls of the air and to the wild beasts of
the earth, that [and] all the earth may [shall] know that there is a God in Israel
47 [Israel hath a God]. And all this assembly shall know that the Lord [Jehovah]
saveth not with sword and spear; for the battle is the Lord's [Jehovah's], and he
48 will give you into our hands. And[33] it came to pass, when the Philistine arose and
came [went] and drew nigh to meet David, that David hasted and ran toward the
49 army [line] to meet the Philistine. And David put his hand in [into] his bag,
and took thence a stone, and slang it, and smote the Philistine in his forehead, and

[24] [Ver. 37. Th. "mouth." The word "hand" should be retained, in the sense of "power."—Tr.]

[25] [Ver. 37. The unapocop. Impf. sometimes occurs in optative sense, as in 1 Sam. iii. 17, יַעֲשֶׂה.—Tr.]

[26] [Ver. 38. Instead of קוֹבַע some MSS. and edd. have כּוֹבַע.—Tr.]

[27] [Ver. 39. Sept. ἐκοπίασε, "labored in going, went with difficulty," as if they read וַיִּלְא, which is not a bad sense. Sym. gives ἐσκαζεν, "limped," and so other (anonymous) Grk. VSS. ἐχώλαινεν, which may represent the text-word or לאה. The Vulg. renders "began" (and so Erdmann), and Syr., Arab., Chald., "did not wish." The Heb. word (הוֹאִיל) more commonly means "to be content, willing," but in some cases expresses determination, resolution, making up one's mind to a thing. Thus in Deut. i. 5 Moses "determines, takes in hand," to explain the law, and in Josh. xvii. 12 the Canaanites "resolved and carried out their resolution" to dwell in the land. Here David resolves, undertakes to walk in armor, *because* he had not tried it; if he had tried it before, he would not have made such a resolution. Thus in the Heb. stem lies the conception of "resolving" with the added idea frequently that the attempt is made to carry out the resolution, so that the Eng. "undertake, assay, begin, succeed in (when the undertaking is carried out), fail (when the undertaking is not carried out)," may in different connections properly render it. So a similar determination is often found in the Heb. and Chald. אבה, which with the neg. means "resolve not to do a thing."—We may then maintain the Heb. text against the Sept., and we see that the Chald. and Syr. have introduced into their translation the expression of the failure which is expressed in the context, and may be involved in the Heb. וַיֹּאֶל.—Tr.]

[28] [Ver. 40. "Fixture" is not a good word; but some general term is needed for Heb. כְּלִי, like Germ. *geräth* or *zeug*. The double name here is suspicious; the second is omitted by Vulg., and translated εἰς συλλογήν by Sept.; but both are given in Chald. and Syr. One may be a gloss.—Instead of "smooth stones," L. de Dieu renders "parts of stones," *i. e.* "sharp pieces," and refers to Isa. lvii. 6.—Tr.]

[29] [Ver. 41. This verse is omitted in Sept., but is in keeping with the liveliness of the whole description.—Tr.]

[30] [Ver. 42. Sept. and a few MSS. read "eyes."—Tr.]

[31] [Ver. 44. Some VSS. and MSS. have "earth."—Tr.]

[32] [Ver. 46. In the Heb. the word is Sing.; comp. Am. viii. 3 for collective force. To this Wellhausen objects that the collective sense is inadmissible before מַחֲנֵה פ׳, and therefore prefers the Sept. reading "thy corpse and the corpses of the camp;" yet פֶּגֶר may here easily—"mass of corpses," as Chald. "putrid flesh."—Tr.]

[33] [Ver. 48. The simpler form of this verse in the Sept.: "and the Philistine arose, and went to meet David," seems not so much in accordance with the tone of the narrative as the more elaborate expression of the Heb. —Tr.]

50 the stone sank into his forehead, and he fell upon his face to the earth. So [And][34]
David prevailed over the Philistine with a [*om.* a] sling and with a [*om.* a] stone,
and smote the Philistine and slew him, but [and] there was no sword in the hand
51 of David. Therefore [And] David ran and stood upon the Philistine, and took
his sword, and drew it out of the sheath thereof, and slew him and cut off his head
therewith. And when [*om.* when] the Philistines saw their champion was dead,
52 [*ins.* and] they fled. And the men of Israel and of Judah arose and shouted, and
pursued the Philistines until thou come to the valley [ravine[35]] and to the gate
of Ekron. And the wounded of the Philistines fell down by the way to Shaaraim,
53 even [and] to [as far as] Gath and to [as far as] Ekron. And the children of
Israel returned from chasing after the Philistines, and they spoiled their tents
54 [camps]. And David took the head of the Philistine, and brought it to Jerusalem,
but [and] he put his armour [trappings] in [into] his tent.

[34] [Ver. 50. This recapitulatory verse (quite in the Heb. manner) is omitted in Sept.—Tr.]

[35] [Ver. 52. Erdmann and others take the Sept. reading "Gath" (גת), instead of "ravine" (גיא), a not improbable correction; yet the VSS. sustain the Heb. reading, which, moreover, as the more difficult, would easily be changed into the obvious "Gath." It is better to retain Shaaraim as a proper name, as a more natural geographical description of the direction of the rout; the rendering: "in the gate-way," moreover, as a climax, ought to follow, not precede, the words: "and to Gath and to Ekron."—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1–11. *The camps of the Philistines and the Israelites confronting one another. Goliath's appearance* on the scene and his arrogant challenge. The power of the Philistines was not broken; they rose with renewed strength against Israel, and made another attempt to reduce them to subjection. The Philistine army *assembled* at *Socoh*, now *Shuweikeh*. This is, however, not the Socoh (also called Shuweikeh) three German [fourteen English] miles southwest of Hebron on the spurs of the mountains of Judah (Josh. xv. 48), but the Socoh west of these mountains in the plain of Judah, about four German [nineteen English] miles southwest of Jerusalem, and about three German [fourteen Eng.] miles southwest of Bethlehem (Josh. xv. 35) in Wady Sumt (Acacia-valley), which Robinson, II., 604 [Am. ed., II., 20, 21] regards as the same with Terebinth-valley (ver. 2), while, according to Thenius, "the latter is probably to be looked for in a branch of that Wady, in Wady Sûr, which runs up towards Beit-Nusib." *Azekah*, whither (Josh. x. 10) Joshua pursued the five kings who were besieging Gibeon, from Gibeon, that is, to the southwest. Its position is in general determined by that of *Ephes-dammim*, the present ruins of Damum, about one Germ. [four and three-fourths Eng.] mile northeast of Shuweikeh. The *rendezvous* of the army was Socoh, the *camp* was at Ephesdammim. On the nature of the ground, according to Robinson, see Ritter, XVI. 114 sq.*—Ver. 2. The Israelitish army assembled and encamped in the *Terebinth-valley*. As the Israelites must have moved from the northeast, the Terebinth-valley must be placed northeast of the Philistine position, and regarded as a plain in Wady Sur or Massur.—Ver. 3. The position of the opposing armies *towards the mountain*, on the declivity of the mountain (this is not in conflict with the Israelitish position in the Terebinth-*vale*, if we suppose lowlands descending from the heights), the two separated by the still deeper bed of a *brook*, is vividly described.—Ver. 4. *Goliath comes forward—description of his person.* He is called "the man of the midst," middleman [champion] because he advances between the two armies (vers. 8, 9) to décide the matter by single combat. (Maurer: "בֵּנַיִם, interval between two things, here between two armies (τὰ μεταίχμια, *Eur. Phœn.* v. 1285, on which the *Schol.* says: "the space between armies where single combats took place), whence אִישׁ הַבֵּנַיִם, one who decides a contest by single combat between two army-lines." Sept. Al., Ἀμεσσαῖος (ver. 23), error for ὁ μεσσαῖος). See examples of similar single combats among the Oriental nations in Stähelin's "*Leben Davids*," Bas. 1866, p. 4.* Neither of the armies dares to attack. Saul and Israel feared the Philistines, instead of bravely attacking the hereditary enemy of the Theocracy in reliance on the help of the Lord. The explanation is found in Saul's false attitude towards the Lord. "The king reckons only with human factors, believing that he has forfeited all claim to help from above. What wonder that his position seems to him in general doubtful, and he thinks it prudent—unbelief makes us cowards—to act merely on the defensive." (F. W. Krummacher.) The plu. "out of the *camps* of the Philistines" does not justify us in accepting the arbitrary rendering of the Sept., "out of the *ranks*;" it refers to the various camp-divisions out of which Goliath came (comp. Ew. § 178 *d*).—*Gath*, one of the five Philistine capital-cities, has now disappeared without trace. When Joshua destroyed the giant race of the *Enakim* (Josh. xi. 21 sq.) in this region, there remained some of them only in Gaza, Gath, and Ashdod (ver. 22). Goliath's *height* is given exactly: *six cubits and a span*. The change in the Sept. of the six to *four* is due to the desire to give plausibility to what seemed incredible. According to Thenius (*die althebr. Längen und Hohlmasse in den Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, 1846, p. 117 sq.) Goliath's height was 9 feet 1 inch (Parisian).† See in Then. and Keil (*Comms.* on this verse) examples of like

* [See Arts. "Socoh," "Azekah," "Ephesdammim," in Smith's *Bib.-Dict.*—Tr.]

* [Examples from classic history in Chandler's "*David*."—Tr.]

† [According to other computations the cubit was eighteen inches, and the span nine inches, Goliath's height, therefore, nine feet nine inches. The copper-shekel is by some estimated at a little over an ounce.—Smith's *Bib.-Dict.*, "Weights and Measures."—Tr.]

tallness in ancient and modern times. The skeletons of Pusio and Secundilla, mentioned by Pliny (N. H. 7, 16) were a Paris inch longer [10 ft. 3 in. Roman measure.] [Keil mentions a giant who came to Berlin in the year 1857, who was as tall as Goliath; and "Chang, the Chinese giant, lately in England, was 7 feet 8 inches high" (*Bib. Com*). On the giants of the Bible see the dictionaries of Winer (Riesen), Herzog (*id.*), Smith, and Fairbairn.—Tr.].—Vers. 5–7. Goliath's *arms* are in keeping with his bodily size: 1) *copper-helmet;* 2) *scale-corselet;* (קַשְׂקֶשֶׂת, according to Num. xi. 9 sq.; Deut. xiv. 9 sq.; Ezek. xxix. 4 = "scale"), a harness or corselet made of overlapping metallic plates (φολιδωτόν, Aq. "clad with scales"), not of chain-rings. Such scale-corselets were common in ancient oriental wars. See Layard, "*Nineveh and its Remains,*" II. 4, and Bochart, *Phal.* III. 13. [Also Kitto, "*Saul and David,*" p. 211 sq., and Philippson *in loco.*] The weight of the corselet, or coat-of-mail, was 5000 shekels; the shekel was not a full German loth [half-ounce]; Then.: "about 139 Dresden pounds." The corselet probably descended far down the body, as we see in the pictures of Assyrian warriors in Layard's "Nineveh." 3) *copper-greaves* on the *legs.* (Read plu. "greaves," as in all ancient VSS.) These greaves did not cover the *thighs* (Bunsen), which in oriental fashion were protected by the corselet. 4) a *copper-lance* between his shoulders. The Heb. "lance" (כִּידוֹן), is to be retained in spite of the reading "shield" (מָגֵן) in Sept., Vulg., Syr., Arab. The text is confirmed by ver. 45, "where the shield would be out of place, with two offensive arms" (Then.).* As the ancients carried even their swords on their shoulders (*Il.* 2, 45; Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1, 2, 8), there is nothing strange in his carrying the javelin "between the shoulders." 5) *a spear,* whose *shaft* (read עֵץ for חֵץ, comp. 2 Sam. xxi. 19; 1 Chr. xx. 5) was like a weaver's beam, and whose head weighed 600 shekels of iron, "somewhat over 16½ Dresden pounds, quite in keeping with the other statements" (Then.). Vers. 8–11. Goliath's contemptuous and fear-inspiring *challenge.* Ver. 8. **He stood and cried** to the ranks of Israel: Why are ye in battle array? behold, I represent the whole Philistine people, and ye are servants of Saul. Send one of you to fight with me, and "let him **come down** to me;" Goliath was standing, namely, in the valley, beneath the Israelites who were encamped on the hill-side.—Ver. 9. The proposed *agreement* to decide the question of subjection by the single combat, which, in Goliath's opinion, would undoubtedly result in favor of the Philistines. Clericus here cites the combat between the Horatii and the Curiatii, and the agreement (*Liv.* I. 23) between the Romans and Albans "that the nation, whose citizens conquered in the combat, should rule the other in peace."—Ver. 10. Goliath's scorn and contempt of Israel lay not merely in the reproach that they were Saul's slaves and in the tone of his words, but also in the challenge itself, because it was not answered.†—Ver. 11. Fear and trembling take possession of Israel with Saul at the head. F. W. Krummacher: "Israel is afraid, because its king is. They dare not in childlike spirit appropriate the promises of Jehovah. The wings that should bear them up in trustful upsoaring to the Lord of Hosts are crippled."

Vers. 12–31. *David in the camp*—his preparation for the combat with Goliath.—Ver. 12. The full account of the person and family of David tells what we already know from chap. xvi., and yet reads as if nothing had been said of his origin. This suggests that the Redactor of the Book here appends and works in a narrative concerning David, which began with the family history, and then related the combat with Goliath and its occasion. This view is supported by the "that" or "this" (הַזֶּה), which is evidently added in order to connect the words with xvi. 1. Vulg. properly: "the above-mentioned Ephrathite." The last words of ver. 12 relating to Jesse, the "Ephrathite" (that is, of *Ephrath*, the old name of Bethlehem, Gen. xlviii. 7, see Ruth i. 1, 2), are difficult. The rendering, with retention of the text, "was come among *the weak*" (D. Kimchi, S. Schmid, Keil) [Eng. A. V. "went among men"] is opposed to the ordinary meaning of the Heb. (אֲנָשִׁים) = "people, men." Bunsen's explanation: "belonged to the men *of standing*" is, by his own judgment, possible only by an arbitrary insertion, and is otherwise meaningless. [Comp. the Targum: belonged to the בחיר, the vigorous young men.—Tr.] Hitzig (see in Thenius) renders: "he was *an old man among men,*" which arbitrarily omits בָּא, "went." It seems best, with Grotius, Thenius, after Sept., Vulg., Syr., Arab., to substitute "in years" (בַּשָּׁנִים) instead of the text, and render "he was *advanced in years.*" This phrase indeed is not found elsewhere, but we have the similar phrase "advanced in days" (Gen. xxiv. 1; Josh. xiii. 1) = *aged.* This statement of Jesse's age gives the reason why he does not himself go into the field, but only his three oldest sons. In the pluperfect "*went . . . . had gone* (Ew. § 346 *c*, A. 3—"the verb standing in sequence is then explained as plup. by means of its own perf.") we have a trace of the effort of the Redactor to work the new narrative, to which the simple "went" belonged, into the whole history. The pluperfect was necessary here, because the account of David's family carries us into a time anterior to the already related appearance of Goliath.* While we have here *eight sons* of Jesse (and so xvi. 10 sq.), only seven are named in 1 Chr. ii. 13–15, David being there the seventh. Clericus rightly supposes that there the name of one of David's brothers is by error omitted. The name of the third, here and xvi. 6–9 written *Shammah,* is *Shimeah* in 1 Chr. ii. 13 [Eng. A. V.: *Shimmi* perhaps after Vulg.—Tr.] and xx. 7,

* [It is not necessary to suppose that the VSS. had a different reading from the Heb.; they were misled by the position of the *kidon* (lance) between the shoulders. See Bochart, *Hieroz.* II., 135-140.—Tr.]

† [The Chald. adds in ver. 8: "I am that Goliath the Philistine, of Gath, that slew the two sons of Eli, the priests Hophni and Phinehas, and carried captive the ark of the covenant of Jehovah, and brought it to the house of Dagon, my Error, and the Philistines have not honored me by making me captain over a thousand . . . . what great thing has Saul done that you should make him king?" This Targum (of the fourth century) has not a few such fanciful expressions of the simple and graphic Heb. text.—Tr.]

* [On this construction see "Text. and Grammat."—Tr.]

Shimei in 2 Sam. xxi. 21 [so Kethib, but Qeri is *Shimeah;* Erdmann writes שִׁמְעָי, putting the vowels of the Qeri under the Kethib, comp. 1 Kings i. 8.—Tr.] and *Shimeah* in 2 Sam. xiii. 3, 32.—Ver. 14. The words: **and the three eldest followed Saul** are a repetition of the statement in ver. 13, and show the pains the Redactor took to introduce his new material clearly and connectedly.—Ver. 15. Here the narrator takes up the "and David" of ver. 12, after having explained that the three oldest brothers had followed Saul to the war. David was "*going* and *returning*" from Saul to feed his father's sheep in Bethlehem; that is, he did not remain constantly at the court of Saul, but went back and forth, to court, and then home to attend to his pastoral duties. This he could do, since Saul was not always in the gloomy state which required David's harp. Inasmuch as it appears from what follows that this *going and returning* from Saul was not from the theatre of war (for then he would already have given account of his brothers, and also his appearance there surprises them), it must have fallen in the time before Saul went to the war. According to this David was not constantly at the court of Saul, and from time to time exchanged the harp for the shepherd's staff. Although, according to xvi. 21, he is Saul's armor-bearer, he is yet not with him in the field; he is even (ver. 33) a boy ignorant of war, and (ver. 28) an unauthorized spectator of the battle. This has been regarded as in conflict with ch. xvi., and therefore the section vers. 12–31 has been declared to be a later interpolation (Mich., Eichh., Dath., Berth., after the Vat. Sept., which omits it), or by another author than that of ch. xvi., and in conflict with the latter (De Wette, Then., Ew., Bleek, Winer, Stähelin). But it is unnecessary to suppose a contradiction here. If Joab, the General, had *ten* armor-bearers (2 Sam. xviii. 15; comp. 2 Sam. xxiii. 37), King Saul would certainly have more than one, as to which note that in xvi. 21 it is not said that David became *the* armor-bearer of Saul [properly: "he became an armor-bearer to him."—Tr.]. As totally unpracticed in war (so ch. xvi. supposes him to be), David, notwithstanding his enrolment among the court-esquires (armor-bearers), could not be needed by Saul in war, and he needed not to be taken along for his music, because in the midst of military affairs Saul's mind was concentrated on *one* point, held by *one* thought. Finally, the words of xvi. 21, 22, do not exclude the supposition that David went to and fro to his father; they rather open a way for it, since his service with Saul had respect to a definite end, which no longer existed when Saul's condition of mind was for a long time better. And so this statement in ver. 15 may be very well harmonized with that of xvi. 21–23; they do not exclude each other. The sentence [ver. 15] is to be taken, in connection with the second half of ver. 14, in a pluperfect sense, and as an addition of the Redactor's, the aim of which is to furnish the connection between xvi. 21, 22, and the following narrative of David's visit from Jesse to the army, which is from another source than ch. xvi.—[*Paraphrase* of vers. 12–17: "Let us leave the army for the present in order to introduce another personage. David was the son of a Bethlehemite named Jesse (already mentioned in ch. xvi.), who, an old man, did not himself go to the war, but had sent his three oldest sons. The youngest, David, had been at Saul's Court, but had been going to and fro to his father's house. It was while the Philistine champion above-mentioned was daily offering his challenge (for he repeated it forty days) that Jesse determined to send David to his brethren." —Tr.].—Ver. 16 connects itself in content with ver. 8, and prepares the way for the progress of the narrative, in order to show how David's conduct on the field of battle over against the bearing of the Philistine was motived by the insolence of the latter. Thenius: "If vers. 12–31 were interpolated, *this* explanatory insertion could not be accounted for at all."—Ver. 17. "Parched peas" (קָלִיא קָלִי, Lev. xxiii. 14; 2 Sam. xvii. 28) [or "parched grain."—Tr.].—According to Thenius the *Ephah*=3 Dresden pecks. "And carry them *quickly* to thy brethren," that is, the parched grain and the bread.—[*Bib. Comm.:* "All the circumstances necessary for the understanding of the narrative having been explained, it now proceeds more smoothly."—Tr.]-Ver. 18. "Cheeses," that is, *pieces* of cheese or curds (literally, milk, so the ancient VSS.). The word cannot mean "milk-portion," that is, *one* milking of a cow (Mich., Schulz), since, as Then. properly remarks, David could not have carried ten such portions with the rest of his load. This gift David is to carry to the captain over a thousand, the chiliarch, under whose command his brothers were. A sketch from military folk-life, such as we often even now see. "And inquire of their welfare" (לְשָׁלוֹם), comp. 2 Sam. xi. 7; Gen. xxxvii. 14; 2 Kings x. 3.—**And take their token**, that is, take a token from them, "that we may see and know that they are well, and that thou hast been with them" (*Berl. Bib.*). The old expositors have here made unnecessary difficulty. The *pledge* was a *token*, which, though David had seen them, would be of special value to the father's heart as an immediate sign from their own hands of their being alive and well (in place of a letter). —Ver. 19 is not an explanatory remark of the Narrator or Redactor, but a part of Jesse's speech to David, who is thus instructed where to find his brothers; we must therefore render in *present* time: "And Saul . . . *are* in the terebinth-vale." —[This construction is favored by the phrase: "and they," which seems more appropriate in Jesse's mouth. Yet the rendering of Eng. A. V. is allowable.—Tr.]—Ver. 20 relates the arrival of David on the field of battle, and thus introduces us into military life. מַעְגָּל* means properly "wagon-track;" it is doubtful how it is to be rendered here and in xxvi. 5, 7. The Complut. Sept. translates by στρογγύλωσις, "rounding," in accordance with the meaning of עָגַל, "to be round," and the usual form of ancient camps

* הַמַּעְגָּלָה [Eng. A. V.: "trench"] the ה is to be taken with Thenius as ה local (comp. x. 10, הַגִּבְעָתָה), and not as feminine ending. [So Gesenius and Buxtorf, but Winer and Fürst as the masoretic pointing. —Tr.]

(Winer, *R.-W.* I. 681). This points not to a wagon-rampart, but to the round circumvallation. Vulg. wrongly: "*ad locum Magala.*—[The Syr. has "camp," the Chald. "fortification," the Arab. "army" or "camp." Erdmann renders "camp-wall," Philippson "wagon-rampart," *Bib.-Com.* "wagons," *i. e.* "wagon-rampart," Calvin, "the place of wagons." This last seems to be the literal meaning of the word (so margin of Eng. A. V.), and best suits the circumstances of 1 Sam. xxvi. 5, 7; the wagons were made into a fortification or rampart. The renderings of Syr. and Arab. are general, of the nature of paraphrases. —Tr.] "The host" is not connected with the preceding verb ("and came to the host"), but begins an independent sentence, in which the original construction "and the host which" is interrupted by the phrase "and they shouted," the subject of which is supplied from "host."*—**And they shouted in the battle**, that is, raised the war-cry. We need not change the Heb. prep. "in" to "to;" it is a pregnant construction: they shouted as men do in battle [or better "they shouted (and advanced) into the battle."—Tr.]—Ver. 21 gives the position of the opposing armies.—Ver. 22. "His baggage," the present that he had to deliver [and anything else that he might have with him.—Tr.]—"He *came* and *asked* after his brothers, in order to learn of their well-being." Clericus: "for he knew that the tribe of Judah was in the front, Num. ii. 3; x. 14."†—Ver. 23. Goliath's advance, already described in ver. 4, and here repeated, first directs David's attention to him, and incites him to the resolution to fight the champion. עֹלֶה [Eng. A. V. "came up"] is not "came on" (De Wette), but "*ascended*," that is, he came over the valley so near to the Israelites, that he advanced some distance up the height on which they were encamped, in order to throw more contempt into his challenge.—(The Kethib, ממערות, can be rendered neither *caterva hominum* (Gesen.), nor *loca plana* (מַעֲרוֹת), nor speluncæ (מְעָרוֹת); these meanings give no good sense. It is better to take the Qeri with Sept. and Vulg. [Chald.] "ranks," or, still better with Then. [Syr.] the *Sing.* "the line.")—Surprising is the description of Goliath: "Goliath the Philistine his name," instead of "Goliath his name, the Philistine of Gath," as the Vulg. [so Eng. A. V.] translates. We need not, however, transpose the Heb. text (Then.), since in the popular language "Goliath the Philistine" may have become a proper name. We see here too that the author is drawing from a narrative whose description of Goliath (which the author retains, though he had already, ver. 4, described him) contained this popular designation of the grant.—Ver. 24. Even the *sight* of Goliath fills the Israelites with fear and trembling.—Ver. 25.‡—The כִּי [Eng. A. V. "surely"] after "have ye seen?" gives the *ground* of the exhortation therein contained to get ready with anger at Goliath's insolent bearing towards Israel; it corresponds to Germ. *ja*, Eng. *surely*. Comp. Mic. vi. 3; Job xxxi. 18; Ges. § 155, 1, *e* (*d*).—**And the man who shall kill him, him will the king enrich**, *etc.* This indicates that Saul had already issued a proclamation, urging the combat with the giant. As generals and princes were accustomed to encourage to such deeds of arms by offering large prizes (Josh. xv. 16; Judg. i. 12; 2 Sam. xviii. 11; 1 Chron. xi. 6), so, according to the talk which passed among the people, Saul had promised the highest possible reward to the conqueror of Goliath: great *riches*, his *daughter* to wife, and *freedom from taxation*. This last is the meaning of חָפְשִׁי, not, as Ewald holds, elevation to the *rank of free lord*, or baron, as the middle rank between king and subjects.—[The word is synonymous with our "free;" see its use in Ex. xxi. 2; Deut. xv. 12; Job iii. 19; xxxix. 5; Ps. lxxxviii. 5 (6), of slaves set free, of a dead man free from the cares of life, of the wild ass at liberty. Here probably of freedom from taxes.—Tr.].*—As in ver. 27 the people give the same answer to David's question (ver. 26), which supposes this offering of rewards to be a usual thing, we must conclude that Saul actually made these promises (though nothing is afterwards said of their fulfilment), especially as the same thing is repeated in ver. 27. From Saul's tendency to rash and exaggerated action, and from his changeableness, we can easily understand both the promise and his unwillingness to perform it.—Ver. 26. The ground and justification of David's question concerning the *reward* of slaying the Philistine is furnished by the high *significance* of the deed as expressed in the words: "and take away the reproach from Israel;" this significance lends the deed such value that Saul, in David's opinion, must assign it a high prize.—**For who is this Philistine**, *etc.*—These words do not, in the first instance express David's desire to fight the Philistine (Keil), but they contain the *ground* of the preceding thought, that the insult offered Israel by the Philistine must be wiped out. This *ground* lies in the contrast (already indicated in the preceding words "the Philistine . . . Israel") between the stand-point of the Philistine as an *uncircumcised* who has no community with the living God, and stands outside of God's covenant with Israel, and the stand-point of this covenant-people, which is expressed in the words: "*ranks of the living God.*" How should this insult of the unclean Philistine cleave to the people of Israel, who are consecrated to the *living* God, whose battle-line, therefore, is also devoted to him? The *living* God is emphasized over against the dead idols of the Philistines. Since the Philistine has reviled the *people of God*, the *covenant-people* of the Lord, he has directed his scorn and derision against the living God Himself; and he who does the deed that takes away this reproach from Israel, will have God on his side, and do the deed with God's help. In these words David is seized with holy anger, whose fire flames up from his theocratic sense of honor, to which violence is done by the Philistine's challenge. His words already indicate his calling, which he has

* [On this construction see "Text. and Grammat." The better translation is: "and he came to the rampart, and the host was going forth to the fight, and they shouted." *etc.*—Tr.]

† [This is a rash conclusion of Clericus.—Tr.]

‡ The ר in הֲרְאִיתֶם with the unusual Dagh. dirimens (as in x. 24)—comp. Ew. § 23 (*b*) with § 71.

* [This throws incidental light on the development of the political organization in Israel, since we have here apparently a regular system of taxes.—Tr.]

received from the Lord, to rouse the people of Israel, by awakening a new and vigorous theocratic spirit, out of the lethargy into which they had fallen in respect to their hereditary foe under the steadily sinking Saul (a lethargy illustrated in the repeated and unanswered challenge of Goliath), to the height of a true theocratic life.—[*Bib. Com.*: "The expression 'the living God' occurs first Deut. v. 26, then Josh. iii. 10; 2 Kings xix. 4; twice in the Ps. (xlii. 2; lxxxiv. 2), four times in the Prophets, and frequently in the New Testament. It is generally in contrast to false gods (1 Th. i. 9, *etc.*)."—Besides Isa. xxxvii. 4, 17; Jer. x. 10; xxiii. 36; Hos. i. 10 (ii. 1); comp. similar expressions in Ps. xviii. 46; Jer. xliv. 26, and the asseveration of Jehovah "as I live" and the significance of the divine name "I am that I am."—Tr.]—Ver. 28. Over against David appears his oldest brother *Eliab* as the representative of a totally different disposition. His words show not merely complete lack of brotherly love for David, but bitterness and hatred towards him. In contrast with David's holy anger, his unholy anger is kindled at David's talk with the soldiers. Perhaps envy and ambition lay at the bottom of this. His two questions: 1) **Why hast thou come down?**—the *down* refers to the relatively elevated position of Bethlehem—and 2) **With whom hast thou left those few sheep in the wilderness?** 1) express the thought: "Thou hast nothing to do here, belongest not here," indicating a haughty, quick-judging nature, and 2) reproach David with neglect of duty as keeper of his father's flocks. While all David's thought and feeling is on the great national disgrace and its removal, and his mind is concerned with plans for saving the honor of Israel and Israel's God, Eliab in his low and blind zeal thinks only of the flock of sheep and the possible loss to them from lack of oversight; the type of a narrow soul, incapable of great thoughts and deeds. But from the reproach of inconsiderate neglect of duty, he passes to a two-fold serious *accusation:* **I know thy arrogance and the naughtiness of thy heart, for to see the battle art thou come down.**—His zeal blinded by envy and jealousy, he ascribes David's visit to the *worst motives:* 1) *pride*, in that he wishes to rise above his shepherd-life and play a part in the war, and 2) *badness* of heart, according to the connection wickedness, brutality, in that he wishes to enjoy himself and please his eyes in the battle. In Eliab's words we see the disposition which he falsely and with hate-blinded zeal ascribes to his brother.—As he forms in word and bearing the sharpest contrast to David, so David's conduct towards him (ver. 29) is in sharpest contrast to him. His answer is quiet, passionless, but a decided and explicit disavowal of the wrong angrily charged on him.—**What have I now done?** that is, nothing that I have done gives ground for the reproaches and accusations which you have addressed to me. Opposed to the "done" (עָשִׂיתִי) is the following "word" (דָּבָר).—**Was it not a word merely?**—This is not: *Was it not a command?* namely, of my father, to come hither, must I not obey (Luther, Gesen.)? for this would be unintelligible to Eliab from its brevity. David would have expressed himself more definitely, if he had meant his father's command. The reply refers to the word (ver. 26) which David had spoken, as appears from what follows; and so the ancient VSS. The sense is: Is not this word permitted me? Can I not seek information by such a word?—Ver. 30. David turned from Eliab to another with the same question, and received the same answer. The meaning of דָּבָר ("word") here and ver. 31 in reference to ver. 26 confirms the view of its meaning in ver. 29.—Ver. 31. "In the presence of Saul," not "to Saul," "markedly expressive of *respectful* announcement" (Then.). David's zeal exhibited to the people for the honor of the Lord and of Israel was the cause of his again appearing before Saul, and the preparation for the deed of heroism by which he was to save the honor of Israel and its God against the scorn of the Philistine.

Vers. 32–40. *David's conversation with Saul on his resolution, and his preparation for the combat with Goliath.*

Ver. 32. **Let no man's heart fail because of him.**—To read (Then. after the Sept.) "my lord" (אדני), instead of "man" (אדם) destroys the general character of the affirmation, which is here so appropriate; for, according to ver. 24, the fear of the Philistine was universal in Israel.—"Heart," here="courage;" comp. Germ. *beherztheit* [literally "heartedness;" so Eng. "courage," from French *cœur*, "heart."—Tr.].—The Pron. "him" is better referred to the Philistine; Then. refers it to Saul [let not my lord's heart fail him"], and Vulg. renders *in eo*, "in him." David first expresses the general thought, "no man's courage must fail on his account," and then individualizes it in the words "I will exhibit such a manly courage."—In this exhortation to courageousness David expresses his own stout courage over against the universally feared Philistine, and the want of courage in Israel. As proof of his courage he announces his *determination to undertake immediately the combat with this Philistine.*—Ver. 33. Against this Saul represents that David as a *youth* cannot venture on a battle with this man, who had been a warrior from his youth. [In xvi. 18 David is designated by the same term, "man of war," which here describes Goliath; but this term would naturally have different meanings as used by the young man in ch. xvi. and by Saul here, and moreover the contrast here rather rather refers to the ages of the two antagonists. David might seem to Saul's retainer a brilliant young "warrior," and yet as a stripling seem to Saul unable to cope with this experienced "warrior."—Tr.]—Ver. 34 sq. To this remark of Saul David, in order to show his courage and strength, replies by narrating a victorious combat with a lion and a bear, which he had while keeping his father's flocks. The Art. [omitted in ver. 34 in Eng. A. V.—Tr.] before "*lion*" and "*bear*" is better understood as representing David's immediate view of the animals in his description [the lion which I now in imagination see before me], than as pointing them out as the well-known animals.* (אֶת before הַדּוֹב is sign of the Acc., Ew. § 277 d.

* [On the varieties of lion and bear found in Palestine anciently and now, see the Arts. in Smith's *Bib.-Dict.*—Tr.]

Böttcher: "As אֵת before the *Nominative* is always either limiting or emphasizing (Jer. xlv. 4; xxxviii. 16 Keth.; Ezek. xliv. 3 *al.*), the form '*and* **what** the bear **was**' very naturally expresses the sense '*and even the bear;*' for the black, ugly bear seemed to the Hebrew still more dreadful than the noble lion, and stands after the latter in a climax (Hos. xiii. 7 sq.; Am. v. 19; Prov. xxviii. 15; Sir. xlvii. 3)." Comp. 2 Sam. xvii. 8, where special strength and courage are ascribed to the bear.—זֶה is clerical error for שֶׂה.) As we cannot suppose that the two animals united in a robbery, David must be regarded as here combining two combats, one with a lion, the other with a bear. The constant use of the singular suffix (ver. 35), which with two subjects is surprising, is not to be explained (Keil) by supposing that David here combines the two exploits, "killed the one beast and the other;" for not only does the "beard" not suit the bear, but the impression made on us by the narrator is that he is thinking of one animal, not of two. It is better to understand ver. 35 of the lion, since he is first named in ver. 34, and the following statement suits him only. Against this cannot be urged the impropriety of speaking of a lion's beard, for the ancients frequently mention it, Hom. *Il.*, 15,275; 17,109; Mart. x. 9. Thus in the words "there came the lion and the bear," there is a vivid description of David's killing the lion, evidently with his shepherd's staff. See 2 Sam. xxiii. 20, where it is related of Benaiah, a captain of David's, that he killed a lion in a pit. On the fact that lions are killed with sticks by the Arabs see Thevenot, *Voyage de Levante*, II., 13. Comp. Rosenm., *Bibl. Thierreich*, p. 132.* Ver. 36. Here David first says expressly that he slew both beasts. He expresses his *confident conviction* that he will likewise slay the Philistine. "The Philistines, this uncircumcised, shall be as one of them." But at the same time he grounds ("seeing that") this conviction and certainty of victory on Goliath's *wickedness*, his defiance of the *ranks of the living God*, wherein we again see David's strong and clear consciousness of the theocratic significance of this battle between the Philistines and the Israelites, whose covenant-God is contemned in His people and their army, and who therefore cannot abandon His people's cause, which is His own.—Ver. 37. David again declares the *ground* of his confidence that he will conquer Goliath, namely, his *trust* in the mighty help of the Lord, which he founds on his experience of that help in the combat with the lion and the bear. The experience of the Lord's help is the foundation of hope for new help.—Saul accordingly permits him to go to the fight, and assures him that the Lord will be with him.—Ver. 38 sq. "His garments" (מַדָּיו) can from this connection mean only garments which pertained to *warlike equipment* (xviii. 4), over which the sword was girded.—Ver. 39. That David puts on Saul's armor shows that he was of about the same stature with him. [Not necessarily, since the armor may have been capable of change of size by tightening.—Tr.] David cannot go, he says, in these garments, not because they are too large, but because he is not accustomed to them. He sees that they would only hinder him in the fight, and lays them off.—Ver. 40. He exchanges the armor for his shepherd's implements, staff and sling. The latter was as necessary to the shepherds as the former, in order to keep off the wild beasts. David must therefore have been well-practiced in its use.—See an example of skill with the sling among the Benjaminites, Judg. xx. 16. So he advanced against the Philistine.

Vers. 41–54. *David's victory over Goliath.*

Ver. 41. The mutual approach of David and Goliath is here again described in a very lively manner: **Goliath drew nearer and nearer to David**, in consequence of David's approach to him (ver. 42). V. 42. As he comes nearer Goliath looks more closely at David and despises him, seeing in him not a warrior, but a pretty youth. This account tallies exactly with xvi. 12.—Ver. 43 sq. The Sept. reads: "Am I as a dog, that thou comest against me with *staff* and *stones?* and David said, Nay, but worse than a dog." The Plu. "staves" seemed to them strange, and was therefore changed into the Sing., and this occasioned the additional words. It stands, as Keil observes, "in scornful exaggeration of what seemed to the Philistine the wholly unsuitable armor of David." The words: "worse than a dog," do not suit David's character; they would be excessive abuse. The Philistine's word: "am I a *dog?*" sets forth his feeling of insult at David's coming against him with a staff, which was ordinarily employed not against men, but against beasts. **And the Philistine cursed David by his god.** Here is shown the innermost contrast which comes into play in the battle between Israelites and Philistines: the contrast between the living God and His people on the one hand, and the idolatrous, antitheocratic world on the other. Similar are the scornful defiances which warriors of antiquity mutually gave at the beginning of a combat.—On ver. 44 comp. Ezek. xxix. 5.—Ver. 45 sq. *David's answer* to Goliath's reproaches contains in an advancing line of thought the most important elements of his character: 1) he expresses most sharply that contrast between their two stand-points in their religious-moral aspect: *Thou* comest to me relying on thine own strength and thy powerful armor, but **I come to thee in the name of Jehovah Sabaoth, the God of the ranks of Israel, whom thou hast defied.** The *name* of the Lord is for David the totality of all the revelations by which the living God has made Himself known and named among His people. Of these elements, which form the conception of the name of God, he here, suitably to the situation, adduces those which characterize Him in respect to His warlike and ruling power as Captain and Conqueror of His people (Ps. xxiv. 10). The words, "*whom thou hast defied,*" form the factual ground of David's *second declaration*, ver. 46: **The Lord will**, because I come against thee in His name, **give thee into mine hand**, &c. David expresses his certainty of victory, but at the same time affirms that it will be God's deed. Triumphal heroic courage before victory, and humble bowing before God as the bestower of victory are here united in David. The ren-

* [See Bochart, *Hieroz.* III., cap. IV., who renders "the lion or the bear," and so refers the exploit to either, which seems better. "Beard" may be used in a general way for "chin." See "Text. and Grammat."—Tr.]

dering of the Sept.: *thy corpse and the corpses* (of the army, &c.) is no doubt occasioned by the strangeness of the Sing. [Eng. A. V. has Plu. "carcasses." See Text. and Gramm.—Tr.]. "Corpse" (פֶּגֶר) is to be taken collectively.—3) By the help which God *the Lord* will grant His people in this victory, *all the world* will know *that Israel has a God*, not: "that God is for Israel." The *sense* is: The other nations will learn that God does not suffer Himself to be mocked in His people, but as their covenant-God helpfully and mightily espouses their cause.—Ver. 47. 4) Together with the *knowledge*, which reaches beyond Israel to the *heathen nations*, that Israel has a protecting and saving God, for Israel themselves (here called "all this assembly") the blessing of this not doubtful victory will be, that they shall know that the Lord needs not *external mighty means*, as sword and spear, for His help; for *His is the battle*, by His almighty will the issue of the battle is determined in His people's favor, arms of war do not secure His help, but His power alone secures success, even when not those arms but seemingly feeble means are employed. He gives the enemy into the hand of His people.—Ver. 48 sq. *Goliath's approach* to David at the beginning of the combat is minutely and vividly described; as well as *David's preparation* for the battle, and its speedy termination. David's unbroken *courage* is made more evident by the remark that he went "*toward the line*" to meet the Philistine. The stone flung from the sling reached Goliath's forehead. The addition in the Sept. "*through the helm*," is a superfluous interpretation. If his forehead and face were covered by the front of the helm, the stone might indeed penetrate through the latter. But it may also be supposed that Goliath, confident of victory, advanced against the despised shepherd-lad with uncovered forehead. Comp. W. Vischer, *Antike Schleudergeschosse* [Ancient Slings], Basel, 1866, p. 5, where he speaks of slingers who could hit the part of the enemy's face at which they aimed.—Ver. 50 sq. expressly declares the superiority of David over Goliath with sling and stone, in accordance with David's words, ver. 47, that victory is not determined by strength of warlike arms. To this refers also the added statement, "David had no sword in his hand," which is at the same time the reason for the following statement, namely, the slaying of the giant with his own sword, with which David cut off his head. After the fall of Goliath the terrified *Philistines* take to flight, without trying a battle. The *Israelites* raised the battle-cry, and pursued them.—Ver. 52. The text reads: "*up to a ravine.*" This gives no good sense, since the ravine between the two armies cannot be meant, nor can we suppose such an indefinite locality, the word not having the Article. As Gath and Ekron are afterwards named as the limit of the pursuit, it is natural to suppose that here גַּיְא ["ravine"] stands by error for גַּת [Gath]. בְּדֶרֶךְ שַׁעֲרַיִם is usually understood of a city, *Shaarim: "on the road as far as Shaarim."* Thenius' objection, that no such city is mentioned elsewhere, is not tenable, for see Josh. xv. 36. Thenius renders after the Sept. "in the way of the gates," understanding by this the whole space between the *outer* and *inner* gate, since city gates were in the form of a building, enclosing a space, and so had two doors (2 Sam. xviii. 24); against which is partly the absence of the Art., partly the double עַד, "up to," as the sign of direction and progress. According to the usual view the Philistines fled along the road from Shaarim partly towards Gath, partly towards Ekron, and many of them were slain. "This direction of the flight resulted from the nature of the country. The Wady Sumt, where the combat took place, passes northward from Socoh, turns after two or three miles westward by the village Sakarieh (שַׁעֲרַיִם. Sept. Josh. xv. 36, Σακαρίμ), emptying into the Wady Simchim; about a mile from this is the village of Ajjur, which is held to be ancient Gath (Rob. II. 606–8 (Am. Ed., II., 66, 67); Ritter, XVI., 91), and so the Philistines fled through the valley that Robinson also traversed in his excursion from Jerusalem to Gath.* Another portion of the Philistines remained in Wady Sumt and fled northward, where the Wady Sumt takes the name Wady Surar, in which lies the present city Akir." Stähelin, *Das Leben David's*, p. 7 sq.—Ver. 53. From this hot pursuit of the Philistines up to their cities the Israelites turned back to spoil the enemy's camp.—Ver. 54. David carried Goliath's head to *Jerusalem*. This is no anachronism, since only the fortress of Jebus on mount Zion was then in the hands of the Jebusites, the city Jerusalem being already in possession of the Israelites (Josh. xv. 63; Judg. i. 21). But why should not this city be selected as the place of deposit of this trophy, since it was the nearest to the field of battle? Goliath's arms, on the contrary, he put into *his dwelling*. אֹהֶל [usually = "tent," as in Eng. A. V.—Tr.] is the ancient word for *dwelling*, as in iv. 10; xiii. 2; 2 Sam. xviii. 17; xix. 8; xx. 1, and here the old homestead in Bethlehem is meant. It is no contradiction that we afterwards (xxi. 9) find the sword of Goliath in the sanctuary at *Nob*; for meantime it might have been carried thither to be permanently kept as sign of the victory granted Israel by the Lord over their old hereditary enemy.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. *David* and *Goliath*, with the two armies, represent the immediate contrast of the godly and antigodly life, of the Theocracy and the Antitheocracy *within the world;* on one side the sincere humility, which bows beneath the hand of the living God, will be only His instrument, only seeks His honor, only strives after the ends of His kingdom, and is therefore by God highly exalted—on the other side the pride and arrogance, which boldly lifts itself above everything divine, puts its trust only in earthly human power, pursues God's kingdom and honor with scorn and contempt, stands up perpetually against God's people to oppress them, but is at last cast down and judged by the Lord.

[At the end of the Psalter *the Sept.* has an additional Psalm referring to this combat, as follows: "This is the autographic (though supernumerary) Psalm of David, composed when he had the single combat with Goliath. I was little among my

* [Robinson declines to fix Gath; Mr. J. L. Porter (in Smith's *Bib.-Dict.*) places it on the Tel-es-Safieh.—Tr.]

brethren, and youngest in the house of my father. I kept my father's sheep, my hands made an organ, my fingers joined together a psaltery, and who will tell it to my lord? He is the Lord, He heareth. He sent His messenger and took me from the sheep of my father, and anointed me with the oil of His anointing. My brethren were handsome and tall, and the Lord was not well pleased with them. I went forth to meet the Philistine, and he cursed me by his idols; and I drew his sword from his side, and beheaded him, and took away reproach from the children of Israel."

This is certainly not genuine (it is given also in the Syriac, Arabic, and Æthiopic versions), but it sets forth the religious-theocratic spirit with which David viewed the conflict. We might have expected that David would thus celebrate his victory; but there is no trace in the Heb. of such a Psalm.—Tr.]

2. *David* and *Eliab* represent *within the people of God* the contrast between the disposition which looks above to the honor and the ends of the living God, and that which looks to earthly possession and earthly-worldly interests, which is not capable of recognising ideal moral motives in others, but judging by itself, ascribes to them only low and selfish aims. Selfishness, passionately roused by envy and jealousy, hinders a just judgment of the bearing and conduct of brethren, and leads to wicked accusation against them.

3. He alone can perform great things for the kingdom of God in its conflict with the hostile world, who like David 1) resists and overcomes himself, and shows true manly courage in patiently bearing the injustice of misunderstanding and calumniation, and not repaying evil with evil; 2) is filled with the fire of holy anger against ungodliness and sin, and of holy enthusiasm for the cause and honor of the Lord; 3) expects not victory from his own strength and human might, but trusts in the Lord alone.

4. That the *world hostile* to God's kingdom can long unpunished visit its scorn on the truth of the eternal and living God, is commonly a result of the inner weakness, disorder, and timidity of the members of the kingdom of God. When, therefore, there arises a man from their midst who with mighty word and deed encounters and conquers the foe, this is a direct interposition of God's hand in the development of His kingdom, and such a man is His chosen instrument for the casting down of the haughty worldly powers, and for a new gathering together and elevation of His people.

5. Those men of God, who contend for the honor and cause of the Lord and His kingdom on earth, are, in unshakable reliance on Him, sure of their victory precisely because they have not their own honor in view, and do not set their hope on human-earthly might. As their trust in their own strength vanishes, their trust in the Lord's help increases, which is not dependent on anything creaturely. A life hidden in God is the source of the most courageous testimony and the greatest prowess, and in the name of God opposes the most inimical powers of this world, joyously certain of the victory of the Lord's cause and of the ends of his kingdom.

See further the remarks in the Exegetical Exposition.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[Ver. 10. Scott: Degenerate professors of religion often receive just rebukes from most decided enemies. . . . In human accomplishments the opposers of the truth of God have frequently possessed an undisputed superiority; confiding in this, they have defied, and still do defy, the advocates of spiritual truth to engage with them; and they dream of a total and decided victory.—Tr.]—Ver. 14 sqq. Schlier: David is acquainted with the Fourth Commandment, and knows that for him God's way always goes in God's commandment. No one has blessing and success in life who has not in youth learned obedience.—Ver. 16. Lange: Without a divine call one should not go into the peril of conflict.—[This remark seems inappropriate here. The Israelites had every call of patriotism and honor, but they did not heed.—Tr.]—Schlier: They are the best rulers, in great things as in small, who have first themselves learned to hearken and serve. The best training for command is obedience.—[" Forty days." Two pictures, every morning and evening: the giant and boastful warrior, with huge weapons, stalking forth and defying Jehovah and His people—and ten miles away the quiet youth, tending his sheep, bearing crook and sling and harp, trusting Jehovah, and all unconscious of his splendid destiny.—Ver. 20. Hall: If his father's command dismiss him, yet will he stay till he have trusted his sheep with a careful keeper. We cannot be faithful shepherds, if our spiritual charge be less dear unto us; if, when necessity calls us from our flocks, we depute not those who are vigilant and conscionable. —Tr.]—Ver. 22. Schmid: Often is that which to man appears thoughtless and rash, a work of the special Providence of God. So we must not be over-hasty in judging.

Ver. 23. Starke: To revile and talk big is the manner of Satan and all his comrades. Ps. lxxiii. 8. O man, guard against it.—To pious souls nothing is more painful than when they are compelled to hear the ungodly revile God. Ps. x. 1 sq.—[Ver. 24. Taylor: Which of us is not sometimes brought almost to a stand-still, when he surveys the ignorance, infidelity, intemperance and licentiousness by which we are surrounded? It seems to us, in moments of depression, as if these evils were stalking forth defiantly before the armies of the living God, and laughing them, Goliath-like, to scorn; and our courage is apt to cool as we contemplate this show of force. But we must not allow these feelings to prevail. The God of David liveth, and He will still give us success.—Tr.]—Ver. 26. Hall: While base hearts are moved by example, the want of example is encouragement enough for an heroical mind. See ver. 23.—Ver. 28. Osiander: See what envy does: how hateful it makes pious people, and how it is wont to excite bitter hate and aversion among brethren! Prov. xiv. 30.—Schmid: Wrath and envy interpret everything in the worse sense, however good it may be in itself.—Hall: There is no enemy so ready or so spiteful as the domestical.—[Scott: In times of

general formality and lukewarmness, every degree of zeal which implies a readiness to go further, or venture more in the cause of God, than others do, will be censured as pride and ambition; and by none more than near relations and negligent superiors: and such censures will seldom be unmingled with unjust insinuations, slanders and attempts to blacken a man's character.—Tr.]

Ver. 29. Starke: We must not be turned away from the execution of the divine will by bad or by good words, by favor or by disfavor.—Hall: He is fitted to be God's champion, that hath learned to be victor of himself.—[Taylor: When we are assailed in our home, or beyond it, with scorn and derision, let us remember that our real conflict in such a case is not with the scorner, but with ourselves. Let our effort be put forth not to silence him, but to control ourselves, and then we shall succeed in obtaining a victory over both.—Tr.]—Ver. 30: Schlier: If you wish to show manly spirit, conquer yourself; if you wish to be brave, subdue your wrath, and learn to curb yourself; if you wish to do great deeds, show it in little things, show it in the duties of common life, show it in the things which the world counts for little, but which are highly esteemed in the sight of God.—Berl. Bible: David troubles himself little as to whether he is praised or blamed, if only God is glorified through him.—[Hall: He whom the regard of others' envy can dismay, shall never do ought worthy of envy. Never man undertook any exploit of worth, and received not some discouragement in the way.—Tr.]—Ver. 32. Cramer: In need and peril one should look not alone to his weakness and the greatness of the peril, but to God the Almighty (2 Chron. xx. 12; 2 Kings xix. 14).—Calvin: God often works in an extraordinary manner in those who undertake a great and glorious work. We must therefore carefully distinguish the general and ordinary powers of the faithful servants of God from their special and extraordinary gifts. When, therefore, we undertake to do something great and difficult, we should earnestly prove ourselves as to whether our powers suffice for it, and whether we trace in ourselves the movement and impulse of divine power, through which alone there is promised us a happy result.—[Ver. 33. Hall: David's greatest conflict is with his friends: the overcoming of their dissensions, that he might fight, was more work than to overcome the enemy in fighting.—Tr.]

Ver. 34. J. Lange: Temptations, when they are rightly regarded and directed, serve to strengthen our joy of faith (Rom. viii. 35 sq.).—Ver. 36. Cramer: When God has once given us help we must always remember it, and encourage ourselves therewith for the future (2 Cor. i. 8; 2 Tim. iv. 16).—Berl. Bible: In this way are the saints accustomed to strengthen and increase their faith through their experience; and so must we also learn to do (2 Cor. i. 10).—Calvin: On the manifestations of God's grace which we have received we should build our hope for the future; for God is always like Himself, and His almightiness constantly the same, and those who call on Him He is always ready to help.—Osiander: He who reproaches God's people, reproaches God Himself.—Ver. 37. Starke: God often produces the greatest things by trifling, and to outward appearance contemptible means and instruments.—Calvin: David goes not into the conflict clothed with human armor, but persists in the confidence firmly rooted in his soul, that God will without human equipment give him the victory over death. For God's power and strength needs no human means; it is sufficient unto itself, and need borrow nothing elsewhere.—Berl. Bible: He who wishes to assure himself of victory must throw away such weapons, and fight with the pure and simple word of God.—[Hall: It is not to be inquired how excellent anything is, but how proper. Those things which are helps to some, may be incumbrances to others. An unmeet good may be as inconvenient as an accustomed evil.—Vers. 39, 40. David's weapons were really best suited to his undertaking. With heavy armor he would have been no match at all for the giant; but lightly armed, he could keep at a distance and might destroy him with his missiles. "Fight the devil with fire," is a very foolish proverb, for with that weapon he will assuredly beat us. In like manner some imperfectly educated preachers attempt to meet the skepticism of the day by preaching about "Science," "Philosophy," or "Criticism," when they might accomplish greatly more by speaking of those experimental and practical subjects which they know how to handle.—Tr.]

Ver. 42 sqq. Schmid: He who despises his enemy before he has tried him, acts very unreasonably.—Cramer: An undeserved curse does not stick (Matt. v. 11).—Berl. Bible: The world always despises believers as a worthless, unarmed mass, not at all furnished with carnal power.—Simple souls have no other weapons than the cross and tranquillity. Therefore are they despised by haughty men.—Ver. 44. Starke: Cursing and big talk are the proper work of godless people. Seldom ever was there a good end of ostentation. Presumption is at once the presage and cause of ruin [from Hall].—Schmid: God requites to the godless upon their own head the evil which they threaten and seek to carry out against the pious. Ps. vii. 17 [16]; cxl. 10 [9].—Ver. 45 sqq.—Schmid: Against God no weapons avail, no strength, yea, not the whole world.—Starke: There is no better fighting than under the shield of the Almighty (Ps. cxl. 1 sq.)—Berl. Bible: The shield that covers me is faith, my sword is the strength of God, in which I have put all my confidence; my spear is the entire freedom from all selfhood, so that I seek no other interest than that of God. In such equipment, namely in entire self-devotion, as I do not trouble myself about the result, I venture all I am and have. [Maurice: In this story everything is said to make us feel the feebleness of the Israelitish champion; everything to remind us that the nation of Israel was the witness for the nothingness of man in himself, for the might of man when he knows that he is nothing, and puts his trust in the living God. . . . And this is the sense which human beings want now as in times of old. . . . To disbelieve this is to fall down and worship brute force, to declare *that* to be the Lord. How soon we may come through our refinements, our civilization, our mock hero-worship, to that last and most shameful prostration of the human

spirit, God only knows.—Tr.]—Ver. 46. Calvin: God's action is of such a kind that by His great deeds He draws all to wonder, and constrains even godless, scornful men to bow before His doing, and against their will to confess that it is not man's, but God's work.—Ver. 47. Cramer: Where human help gives out, divine help begins again, that the honor may be God's (Judg. vii. 2).

Ch. XVII. 1–50. J. Disselhoff: *The first sending of the anointed one out of stillness into strife:* 1) He does not seek to hurry out of the stillness into the peril of the strife: but he goes with confidence when he is sent; 2) He seeks in the strife not his own interest, but only the honor of his Lord and the welfare of His people; 3) His only weapon is faith in the living God and His cause, and this weapon is his victory.—F. W. Krummacher: *David and Goliath:* 1) Israel's need, and 2) The divine deed of deliverance through David.

Vers. 1–11. *The decisive conflict between the people of God and the world which is hostile to God:* 1) The two camps, which stand over against each other (vers. 1–3); 2) The weaponed might in which the enemy comes forth to challenge the host of Israel (4–8); 3) The decision as to servitude or dominion, with which this conflict is occupied (9); 4) The proving which the people of God have to stand in presence of the challenge to this conflict (10, 11).

Vers. 12–31. *How the Lord leads His servants, in order to prepare them for the victorious conflict for the honor of His name:* 1) Out of retirement into the stirring life of the world, vers. 12, 13, (comp. with xvi. 17–23); 2) Out of the conflict-stirred world into the stillness (vers. 14, 15); 3) Out of the stillness into the conflict of the world (vers. 17–31).

Vers. 32–41. *The brave spirit of a soldier of God over against the might of the enemy:* 1) Wherein it *shows* itself: *a*) In the *strength* and *encouragement* with which it can lift up the dejected hearts of others (ver. 32 *a*); *b*) In the bold *resolution* with which it goes to meet the mighty foe in conflict notwithstanding his apparent superiority (32 *b*); *c*) In the endurance of the temptation and assault which are prepared for it by taking counsel with flesh and blood (33); 2) Whereon it *grounds* itself: *a*) On the *help* of the Lord already experienced in victorious conflict (vers. 34–36 *a*, 37); *b*) On the prize of the conflict, the *honor* of the Lord (36 *b*); *c*) On the divine equipment assumed instead of carnal weapons, namely, the *power* of the Lord (38–41).

Vers. 42–54. *Faith contending with the world for the honor of the Lord:* 1) *Called forth* by scoffing at the Lord's *honor* (42–44); 2) *Ready for conflict* in the Lord's *name* (45); 3) *Sure of victory* in reliance on the Lord's *help* (46–48); 4) *Crowned with victory* through the Lord's *might* (49–54).

Vers. 42–47. *The battle-cry in the kingdom of God: "The battle is the Lord's."* 1) The *enemy* is the enemy of the *Lord* and of His *kingdom* 42–44); 2) The *armor* is the *name* of the Lord (45); 3) The *combatants* are the *people* of the Lord, whom He acknowledges as His possession (46); 4) The *victory* is the *gift* of the Lord, unto the honor of His name (47–54).

Vers. 48–54. *The defeats which are prepared for the world by the kingdom of God:* 1) *Through what sort of combatants?* Through such as *a*) like David heroically *lead the van* of God's host and decide the conflict (ver. 48), and *b*) such as bravely *bring up the rear*, perseveringly pursuing the already-smitten foe. 2) *With what sort of weapons?* *a*) With weapons which *they themselves* have according to their calling through God's grace and wield in reliance on God's help (ver. 49), and *b*) with weapons which they take *from the foe*, in order to give him the finishing stroke with his own weapon (50, 51). 3) *With what sort of result?* *a*) In respect to the foe: Annihilation of his power on his own ground (52), and *b*) in respect to the *booty*, rich gains (53, 54).

[Vers. 8–11. "*A man.*" 1) Often in civil and religious conflicts one man is wanted to fight the battles of his brethren—the need of the hour is *a man*. 2) Often *Providence is preparing* the man, not far away—perhaps no one would now dream that he is the man—his pursuits would not suggest it, nor the character he has thus far developed—his friends do not know what is in him (xvi. 11; xvii. 28)—the enemy may despise him at his first appearance (43, 44). 3) Yet looking back one can always see that there was *no accident*—that he had the suitable combination of native qualities—and that his pursuits gave the requisite training.

Vers. 28–30. *David and his brother.* 1) The elder brother slow to recognize that his younger brother is a grown man. 2) The unjust judgment and unmerited public rebuke. 3) The young man's self-contained and conciliatory reply. 4) His quiet perseverance in acting out the sacred impulse within (ver. 30, comp. ver. 26).—Tr.]

III. *The Immediate Consequences of David's Exploit in Respect to his Relation to Saul.*

David at the Royal Court; his Friendship with Jonathan; Saul's Hatred towards Him; Saul's Attempt on his Life.

CHAPTER XVII. 55—XVIII. 30.

1. *David at the Royal Court.*

CHAP. XVII. 55–58.

55 AND[1] when Saul saw David go [going] forth against the Philistine, he said unto
Abner, the captain of his host, Abner [*om.* Abner], Whose son is this youth? [*ins.*
Abner]. And Abner said, As thy soul liveth, O king, I cannot tell [do not know].
56, 57 And the king said, Inquire thou whose son the stripling is. And as David
returned from the slaughter of the Philistine, Abner took him and brought him
58 before Saul, with [and] the head of the Philistine [*ins.* was] in his hand. And
Saul said unto him, Whose son art thou, *thou* [*om.* thou] young man? And David
answered [said], *I am* [*om.* I am] the [The] son of thy servant Jesse the Bethlehemite.

2. *David's Friendship with Jonathan. He is made General of the Army.*

CHAPTER XVIII. 1–5.

1 And it came to pass, when he had made an end of speaking unto Saul, that the
soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his
2 own soul. And Saul took him that day, and would let him no more go home
3 [would not let him return] to his father's house. Then [And] Jonathan and David
4 made a covenant, because he[2] loved him as his own soul. And Jonathan stripped
himself of the robe that was upon him, and gave it to David, and his garments
[war-dress], even to his sword, and to his bow, and to his girdle.
5 And David went out whithersoever Saul sent him, *and* behaved himself wisely.[3]
And Saul set him over the men of war, and he was accepted in the sight of all the
people, and also in the sight of Saul's servants.

3. *David is hated by King Saul.* Vers. 6–16.

6 And it came to pass as they came, when David was [*om.* was] returned from the
slaughter of the Philistine,[4] that the women came out of all the cities of Israel,
singing and dancing,[5] to meet King Saul, with tabrets, with joy and with instru-

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 55. The passage xvii. 55—xviii. 5 is omitted by Vat. Sept., but by no other ancient version. Whether it was wanting in the Heb. MSS. used by the Alexandrian translators, or omitted by them to avoid an apparent contradiction, it is almost impossible with our present lights to decide. We do not know what MSS. they had. Erdmann and others regard the passage not as an interpolation, but as an account taken from an authority different from that of xvi. 14–23, and irreconcilable with it. For a proposed reconciliation see Erdmann's Introduction and Note and Remark of Translator in the Exposition following.—TR.]

[2] [Ver. 3. The Sing. pron. is due to the fact that "Jonathan" is the real subject in the foregoing clause.—TR.]

[3] [Ver. 5. The verb שָׂכַל means in Hiph. properly "to act prudently;" but there is sometimes connected with this the notion of success, as probably throughout this chapter. ו is to be supplied before the verb.—TR.]

[4] [Ver. 6. Margin of Eng. A. V. "Philistines," and so the Arab.; the other VSS. have the Sing., which is to be preferred here, though the return at the end of the campaign is meant, because the slaying of Goliath was its most prominent event.—TR.]

[5] [Ver. 6. The Heb. is difficult. The Sept. has merely: "And the dancers came out to meet David," *etc.*, omitting the first clause perhaps to avoid the statement that David excited Saul's jealousy on the day of his combat with Goliath, and yet was afterwards preferred by him to places of honor. This difficulty is removed if we suppose this verse to refer to the end of the campaign (Philippson).—Chald. has "to praise with dances," Syr.

7 ments of music [triangles]. And the women answered one another as they played,
8 and said, Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands. And Saul
was very wroth,[6] and the [this] saying displeased him; and he said, They have
ascribed [given] unto David ten thousands, and to me they have ascribed [given]
but thousands; and what can he have more but the kingdom? [there remains for
9 him only the kingdom.][6] And Saul eyed[7] David from that day and forward.
10 And it came to pass on the morrow that the evil spirit from God came upon
Saul, and he prophesied[8] in the midst of the house; and David played [was play-
ing] with his hand as at other times, and there was a javelin in Saul's hand [and
11 Saul's javelin was in his hand]. And Saul cast[9] the javelin, for he [and] said, I
will smite David even to [I will pin David to] the wall *with it* [*om.* with it]. And
12 David avoided out of his presence [turned away from him] twice. And Saul was
afraid of David, because the Lord [Jehovah] was with him, and was departed from
13 Saul. Therefore [And] Saul removed him from him, and made him his [*om.* his]
14 captain over a thousand; and he went out and came in before the people. And
David behaved himself wisely in all his ways, and the Lord [Jehovah] was with
15 him. Wherefore when [And] Saul saw that he behaved himself very wisely, [*ins.*
16 and] he was afraid of him. But all Israel and Judah loved David, because he
went out and came in before them.

4. *Saul's Artful Attempt against David's Life in the Offer of Marriage with his Daughter.* Vers. 17–30.

17 And[10] Saul said to David, Behold my elder daughter Merab, her will I give thee
to wife; only be thou valiant for me, and fight the Lord's [Jehovah's] battles.
For [And] Saul said, Let not my hand be upon him, but let the hand of the Phi-
18 listines be upon him. And David said unto Saul, Who am I? and what[11] is my
life, *or* [*om.* or] my father's family in Israel, that I should be son-in-law to the
19 king? But it came to pass at the time when Merab, Saul's daughter, should have
been given to David, that she was given unto Adriel,[12] the Meholathite, to wife.
20 And Michal, Saul's daughter, loved David; and they told Saul, and the thing
21 pleased him. And Saul said, I will give him her, that she may [and she shall] be
a snare to him, and that [*om.* that] the hand of the Philistines may [shall] be
against him. Wherefore [And] Saul said to David [*ins.* the second time],[13] Thou
shalt this day be my son-in-law in *the one* of the twain [*om.* in the one of the twain].

renders the second word "drums." Wellhausen proposes to substitute (after the Sept.) הַמְּחוֹלְלוֹת for הַנָּשִׁים. According to Ew., § 339 *a* we may translate: "for song and dance;" but this is difficult here on account of the Art. and the nature of the words, and it seems better to change the Art. ה into ל and render as in Vulg. and Eng. A. V., or with Thenius to insert בְּ, and render "song with dancing."—The Kethib "to sing" (so Chald. and Syr.) is preferable in the latter case, the Qeri "for song" in the former.—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 8. These two clauses are omitted in the Sept., which has thus a noticeable simplicity and directness in its narrative, but loses much of the warmth and life of the Heb. To reject these clauses as "exaggerated" and "psychologically inaccurate" (Wellhausen) is obviously carrying subjective criticism too far. The historical authority is every way in favor of the Heb. text.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 9. Keth. Partcp. of stem עוֹן, Qeri of st. עִין. Sept. omits vers. 9–12, as to which see remark on ver. 8. This passage may be omitted without injuring the sense; but it adds to the vividness of the narrative, agrees with xvi. 14–23, and rests on the same authority as the other portions of the chapter.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 10. Erdmann and Philippson: "raved," and so Wordsworth and the Targum; the Syr., Arab. and Vulg. and most Eng. commentators (Patrick, Gill, Clarke, *Bib. Com.*) render "prophesy." See the Exposition. —Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 11. The Greek (Alex. MS.) and Chald. have "lifted," as if from נָטַל, and this seems better (וַיִּטֹּל), since it does not appear that he actually cast the weapon (see xix. 10).—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 17. The passage vers. 17–19 is omitted in Sept. (Vat.), namely, the story of Merab, perhaps as apparently useless in advancing the narrative. The name Merab means "increase." Comp. in Eng. the well-known "Increase Mather."—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 18. Literally "who is my life?" which is explained by the following clause; but this clause is not therefore necessarily a marginal (unauthorized) addition. The Alex. Sept. has: "what is the life of my father's family?" which is clear, but unsupported.—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 19. Some MSS. and VSS. have Asriel.—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 21. The Heb. text (בִּשְׁתַּיִם) seems to be supported by all the VSS. (the clause is omitted in Vat. Sept.). The translation here given (which is that of Thenius, Erdmann, Wordsworth, *Bib. Com.*) is the most satisfactory as to sense; but its correctness is open to doubt. Philippson renders: "with the second," the older Eng. Comms. follow the Targ.: "in one of the two." Theodotion has the ingenious rendering: ἐπὶ ταῖς δυσίν, and another Gr. VS.: ἐφ' αἱρέσει. The Arab. cuts the knot by translating: "I wish thee to be my son-in-law," herein forsaking the Syr., which has "in both of them." Some Jews held that David married both the daughters.—Tr.]

22 And Saul commanded his servants, *saying*, Commune [Speak] with David secretly,
and say, Behold the king hath delight in thee, and all his servants love thee; now,
therefore, be the king's son-in-law. And Saul's servants spake these words in the
23 ears of David. And David said, Seemeth it to you a light thing to be a [the]
24 king's son-in-law, seeing that I am a poor man and lightly esteemed? And the
servants of Saul told him, saying, On this manner spake David.
25 And Saul said, Thus shall ye say to David, The king desireth not any dowry
but[14] an hundred foreskins of the Philistines, to be avenged of the king's enemies.
26 But Saul thought to make David fall by the hand of the Philistines. And when
[*om.* when] his servants told David these words, [*ins.* and] it pleased David well
27 to be the king's son-in-law; and the days were not expired.[15] Wherefore
[And] David arose and went, he and his men, and slew of the Philistines two[16]
hundred men, and David brought their foreskins, and they [*better om.* they[17]] gave
them in full tale to the king, that he might be the king's son-in-law. And Saul
28 gave him Michal his daughter to wife. And Saul saw and knew that the Lord
[Jehovah] was with David, and *that* [*om.* that] Michal,[18] Saul's daughter, loved
29 him. And Saul was yet the more afraid of David, and Saul became [was] David's
30 enemy continually. Then[19] [And] the princes of the Philistines went forth. And
it came to pass, after [as often as] they went forth, that David behaved himself
more wisely than all the servants of Saul, so that his name was set by.

14 [Ver. 25. Some MSS. have כִּי אִם, which is not necessary, since כִּי alone may mean "but;" or it may be taken as—"for."—Tr.]

15 [Ver. 26. This clause is omitted in Vat. Sept. See on ver 8.—Tr.]

16 [Ver. 27. This number is sustained by all the VSS. except Vat. Sept., which has "one hundred," probably to avoid an apparent contradiction. Here the presumption is not in favor of the smaller number (Wellhausen), but in favor of the harder reading. Wellh. refers to 2 Sam. iii. 14, where the Heb. has 100, and the Syr. 200, which perhaps shows a disposition to exaggerate, but cannot be regarded as decisive against our text.—Tr.]

17 [Ver. 27. The Sing. is found in Sept., Aq. and Theod., as well as in Vulg., Syr., Arab.—Tr.]

18 [Ver. 28. Sept.: "all Israel," which is better suited to the context.—Tr.]

19 [Ver. 30. This verse is omitted in Sept. (Vat.).—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 55–58. *David at the royal court*, his lineage better known, and himself permanently taken up.—On the relation of this section to xvi. 14–23 (the two coming from different sources), and to the general narrative, see the full discussion in the Introduction, p. 16 sqq. Considering the undeniable difference between the account here (where Saul is ignorant of David's person and family), and that in xvi. 14–23, (where Saul, after negotiation with Jesse, takes David to his court, and keeps him till the outbreak of the war), and considering the vain attempts which have been made to harmonize this difference, we accept Nägelsbach's conclusion (Herz. xiii. 402): "All attempts at reconciliation failing, we can only, till a satisfactory explanation is found, suppose that these two accounts come from really different and discrepant sources." [Without laying stress on the fact that Saul here inquires after David's father, and not after David himself (which, though urged by Houbigant, Chandler, Wordsworth, and others, does not seem to amount to anything), we may still insist that the two accounts, though different, are not necessarily discrepant in the sense that both cannot be true. It is only necessary to admit that David's absence at home had been long (and there is no exact chronological datum), that Saul had rarely seen him except in moments of madness, that Abner had been absent from court when David was there, and that the personal appearance of the latter had changed (suppositions which, taken singly or together, are not improbable), and Saul's ignorance becomes natural. These old narratives, giving brief and partial views of occurrences, may well sometimes seem to contradict each other, and it is wise (as Nägelsbach hints) in view of the historical authority of the Heb. text, at least to suspend our judgment.—Tr.]

Ver. 55. We need not take the verbs here as Pluperf. (Then., Keil, &c.), since this narrative is to be regarded simply as an addition to the preceding. In their context vers. 55, 56 belong after ver. 40 and form a supplement to the vivid description of David's advance against Goliath. The words "against the Philistine" refer to the close of ver. 40. Saul's question is to be understood not merely of David's father and family, but also of his person. According to this Saul does not know him. The question and Abner's answer must necessarily be taken in connection with the surprise and astonishment felt at David's bold procedure. Saul's question could not be answered till David's return; it is therefore mentioned here, and connected with David's appearance before Saul under Abner's guidance.—Vers. 57, 58. The concluding words of ver. 57: "and the *head*," &c., show that this statement is to be put between ver. 53 and ver. 54. According to this Abner's leading David to Saul was occasioned by the latter's question. David's words in ver. 58 are not to be regarded as forming his whole answer; from xviii. 1 we infer that he had a somewhat long conversation with Saul.

2. Ch. xviii. 1–5. *David's friendship with Jonathan and permanent residence at Saul's court* as commander of the army. Ver. 1. The consequence of this conversation was the formation of a friendship between David and Jonathan, as is indicated by the words: "when he had ceased speaking

with Saul." The word "knit" (נִקְשְׁרָה as in Gen. xliv. 30) denotes, under the figure of a chain, the firm union and inseparable unity of souls in friendship, expressing the thought that their inner lives of feeling work deeply into each other, and so each has perpetually fast hold of the other. Clericus: "In almost all languages friendship is considered as a union of souls bound together by the band of love." Grotius: "An admirable description of friendship. So Aristotle (Nicom. IX. 8) has noted that friends are called *one soul*. The same thing is set forth by the Lat. concordia and the Greek *ὁμονοία*. Papinius says that souls are bound together."—**And Jonathan loved him as his own soul.** To the conception of firmness is here added the idea of *innerness* of friendship, the *complete identification of essence* of two souls.* (The Kethib has the rarer contracted suffix ו, the Qeri the commoner וֹ. Ew. § 249 b).—David's heroic courage, firm trust in God, and splendid feat of arms had won him Jonathan's heart.†—Ver. 2. Not till after the narrative of this friendship follows the statement that Saul took David permanently to court: *he took him*, that is, into his service, *and allowed him not* to return to his father's house, as he had done in ch. xvii. 15; the words presuppose that David had desired to return thither. That Saul virtually ordered David's permanent stay with him immediately after their conversation (Keil) is not necessarily to be assumed. Rather from the sequence of the sentences it seems as if the narrator intended to connect the rise of the friendship of David and Jonathan with the friendly relation which Saul first assumed in his conversation with David, and then to set forth David's permanent stay at court as a consequence of this friendship.—Ver. 3. Jonathan's love for David (he loved him as his own soul) is the ground of this solemn and formal sealing of their friendship. The *covenant* indicates the mutualness of the love which they pledged one another. Grot.: "they mutually promised perpetual friendship," comp. xx. 3.—Ver. 4 is closely attached to ver. 3 in so far as here by the gift of the upper garment, the robe (מְעִיל) and the separate parts of the war-equipment to David, the conclusion of the covenant of friendship on Jonathan's part is solemnly confirmed. Clericus supposes that the object of this gift was to enable the poorly-clad David to appear at court in seemly dress. But the mention of the several weapons, which together make a complete war-outfit, rather suggests that Jonathan wished to honor David as the military hero; and this manner of sealing their friendship was a proof that the two, as heroes, equally crowned by God with victory, could love one another, and that Jonathan was far from feeling envy and jealousy of David for his heroic deed. Jonathan's here taking the initiative is in keeping with his position at court as king's son in respect to the young shepherd. His clothing David with his own war-dress is sign that his hearty friendship sets aside the barrier which his rank and position would raise between them in the first instance on the common ground of the theocratic chivalry, as whose representatives they had come to love one another. [Philippson: The gift of one's own garment, especially by a prince to a subject, is in the East still the highest mark of honor. So in "Esther" (ch. vi.) Mordecai is clothed in the king's apparel.—Tr.]—Ver. 5 belongs to what goes before as the declaration of the honorable position which David (along with this relation to Jonathan) took at Saul's court, as generally beloved in his office and calling. First, his *position* was a *military* one; for that the "*went out*" (which is to be taken separately, and not connected with the following)* refers to war, and not to "general business" [Clericus] is plain not only from the following account which mentions not only military undertakings for Saul, but also from the statement of the position of General which he received in consequence of his success in what was entrusted to him, and from the account of the military equipment which Jonathan (ver. 4) presented to him. **In all, whereto Saul sent him, he was successful.**—His warlike undertakings were *fortunate* and *successful*. The Verb (הִשְׂכִּיל) means "to act prudently, wisely" and then to be successful," as in Josh. i. 7 [Eng. A. V. "prosper"]. It always refers to conduct, "to act wisely, and then to be prosperous in one's undertakings." **Saul set him over the men of war**, that is, made him a military officer. He was appointed commander of a body of soldiers.—David soon attained to high consideration and acceptance in the eyes of all the people, **and also in the sight of Saul's servants.**—By this term we are to understand the officials at Saul's court. David's *winning loveliness of character* is here brought out more strongly by the statement that he did not excite the envy and jealousy of his fellow-officials at court. Clericus: "he pleased even the courtiers, who are commonly envious, especially of those who have newly found favor with the king." This idea is involved in the "and also" [= and even]. [Philippson: "As he was afterwards promoted to be chiliarch, he must here have been made centurion." But see on ver. 13.—Tr.]

3. Vers. 6–16. Here is related how *Saul's deadly hatred against David* springs from envy and jealousy. As the section xvii. 54–58 lays the foundation for David's permanent stay at the royal court—and as the section vers. 1–5, being the summary description of David's personal relations to Saul's family as Jonathan's friend, and to the court-officials and the people as military commander, explains what is afterwards said of David's relation to Jonathan and of his military career—so in this section, vers. 6–16, we have the cause of the deadly hate which Saul henceforth bore in his heart against David, there being preserved (a fact to be noted) in ver. 5 a significant silence as to Saul's feeling towards him, only the friendly disposition of Jonathan and of the offi-

* [The German (obviously by oversight) has: "and he loved Jonathan as his soul," and explains it as the expression of the formation of friendship on David's part.—Tr.]

† [Jonathan's conduct no less exhibits his own lofty and generous nature (*Bib. Com.*).—Tr.]

* [Erdmann translates (not so well): "And David went out; everywhere, whither Saul sent him, he was prudent (successful)." This is to avoid supplying "and" before "was prudent;" it seems better (with Chald., Syr.) to supply "and." See "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

cials and people being mentioned. That no strict chronological advance is attempted in the narrative in xvii. 55 sq. is clear from the above remarks. As in ch. xvii. ver. 55 belongs as to its contents to ver. 40, and ver. 57 belongs next to ver. 54, so ver. 6 here is not connected in context and time immediately with ver. 5, but goes back to xvii. 52, 53. In vers. 1–4 is told what happened to David immediately after his victory over Goliath; he became Jonathan's friend, and was permanently fixed at court. That was the immediate result of his exploit (which decided the issue of the war with the Philistines.) In ver. 5 we have a further consequence: Saul employs David in warlike enterprises against the Philistines, and gives him command of a body of troops. But, according to xvii. 52, 53, the war with the Philistines was not ended by the victory over Goliath; on the contrary, they were again several times defeated, and their camp was plundered by the victorious Israelites on their return from pursuit. That Saul in thus finishing the war employed David as a bold leader is clearly stated in ver. 5, wherewith is also summarily told how David in his new position won the favor of the people and also of Saul's servants, while it is not said that Saul in appointing him to office bestowed his favor on him. The narration of ver. 6 now, going back to xvii. 53, connects itself with the return of the people and of David from the concluded war, in order to point out how on this occasion Saul's ill-will and hatred towards David arose, on which is founded the whole of the following narrative of the relation between David and Saul. The "*as they came*" refers to the *return of the whole army* from the happily ended war (comp. xvii. 53); at the same time is mentioned *David's return* with express reference to his victory over Goliath, which had determined the successful issue of the war, in order to bring into its proper historical connection the honor which then accrued to him. *This* return of David, therefore (along with the whole army), is not synchronous with his return to Saul in xvii. 57 immediately after the killing of the Philistine, but occurred after the victory over the whole Philistine army was completed. Here began Saul's envy and hatred against David. There is, therefore, no contradiction between the statement that Saul kept David by him and gave him a military command (vers. 2, 5), and the following statement (ver. 6 sq.) that in consequence of the honor shown David he conceived a lasting hatred against him (ver. 9).—We have the description of the *festive reception* given by the women from all the cities of Israel to the returning victorious army, Saul at its head. In the words: **with song and dance** the Art. [in Heb.] points to the usual employment of song and dance in such receptions. They met Saul **with tabrets, with joyful outcry, and with triangles.** Here שִׂמְחָה ["joy"], standing between the two instruments of music, must denote, in distinction from the song of joy, the joyful cry which accompanied the beating of the tabrets. For dances accompanied by tabrets see Ex. xiv. 20.—Ver. 7. The women performed an *antiphonal song;* "they answered one another in turn" (Cleric.). The Partcp. (מְשַׂחֲקוֹת [Eng. A. V. "played"]) means perhaps alternate dancing, corresponding to the alternate song (Winer: Contredance s. v. Tanz), along with the choral dancing (מְחֹלוֹת). The Piel of שָׂחַק, "laugh," properly = "sport, play," *e. g.*, of children on the street, Zech. viii. 5.*—The song: "Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands" (comp. xxi. 12 and xxix. 5)—a part of a folk-song, which shows the great consideration in the sight of the people which David had obtained by his victory over Goliath.—Ver. 8. *Saul was very wroth* that greater honor was paid to David than to him. **And there is yet only the kingdom for him,** that is, for him to obtain. In this outburst of wrath he expresses in a curt ejaculation the well-founded anticipation that the so highly honored David would receive the royal dignity in his place. Clericus: "especially since Samuel had more than once predicted that it would pass into another family."—Ver. 9. From this point dated the evil, curious eye with which Saul henceforth looked on David.† Clericus: "in these words we see envy and jealousy." Luther: "And Saul looked sourly on David." It is an express statement of the continuous bitterness of Saul against David from now on.—Vers. 10, 11. Saul's anger against David rises to *madness* and to *murderous purpose.* **The evil spirit from God came upon Saul.** Comp. xvi. 14: "וַיִּתְנַבֵּא [Eng. A. V. "prophesied;" Erdmann, "raved"], the influence of the evil spirit, analogous to the ecstatic condition of inspiration in which the good spirit from God put the prophets: *he raved, raged.* The old condition of internal disorder again came over Saul, now heightened by envy and jealousy against David. As in xvi. 23, David seeks by playing on the harp to mitigate Saul's rage. But as he was its object, the madness takes the form of an attempt on his life. The *harp* in *David's hand* and the *spear* in *Saul's hand*—taking the place of the sceptre, xxii. 6—are here put in sharpest contrast to one another.—[Saul's condition of mind is neither that of simple madness nor that of true prophecy. He is under the control of a power higher than himself; but it is an evil power. For the precise expression of this supernaturally-determined condition of mind and soul, in which the whole spiritual energy of the man moves freely, yet in a sphere into which it is supernaturally brought, becoming for the time one with the spirit, the Heb. has no other word than *naba* (נבא), and the Eng. no other word than *prophecy.* R. P. Smith ("*Prophecy a Preparation for Christ,*" II. 54 sq.) points out a difference between the Niphal (generally but not always used of true divine prophecy) and the Hithpael (generally but not always of false prophecy), and we may here render: "he acted the prophet" (so here Junius); but it is desirable to exhibit in the translation, if possible, the supernatural element. Whether the Eng. "prophesied" will bear the meaning "spoke like a prophet" or "raved supernaturally" is doubtful; but it is so used of false prophets in Eng. A. V. in 1 Kings xxii. 10 (Hithp.) and 12 (Niph.).—Tr.]—Ver. 11. (וַיָּטֶל, Hiph. of טוּל.

* [And see Judg. xvi. 25 for its use on festive occasions.—Tr.]

† עוֹיֵן, "eyeing," Denom. from עַיִן, "eye."

properly "to stretch out longitudinally," comp. Ps. xxxvii. 24). As it is not said, that Saul actually threw the spear against the wall (as in xix. 10), the sense rather is: "he *purposed* to throw;" and we are to suppose a threatening movement of the arm.*—**David turned, withdrew** before this threatening movement. *Twice* he did so; this supposes that Saul twice lifted his spear. This also proves that Saul only *moved,* did not *throw* the spear, as in xix. 10. Bunsen well observes: "If Saul actually threw the spear, we could not understand David's twice retiring. Saul held the spear in his hand, and David stood so near him that he could save himself only by withdrawing." This is therefore not *the same* thing as what is told in xix. 9, 10, where Saul actually throws the spear, which pierces the wall. The Sept. has after its manner arbitrarily omitted this section vers. 9–11, because it wrongly assumed the identity of the two accounts.—Ver. 12 relates how Saul's heart was divided between fierce envy and *fear* of David; the latter became an object of fear to him. The *reason* given for this is that *the Lord was with David, and was departed from Saul.* Through the honor accorded David for his God-given victory Saul became aware of what had already taken place, namely, that he was forsaken and rejected by the Lord.—Ver. 13. Enmity against David (born of envy and jealousy) and fear of him (as one specially blessed by God) led Saul *to remove him from his presence.* —**He made him captain over a thousand.** This means a different military position from that mentioned in ver. 5, "whether it denotes a higher position than the first, or the latter means an undefined promotion, as to which we can now hardly determine with certainty" (Keil).—**He went out and in before the people** is to be understood of David's military undertakings.—Ver. 14. Here as before (ver. 5) David is in everything prosperous. Whereby Saul's fear (which had led him to remove David from his side) is only increased, *he was afraid of him* (ver. 15); for he saw afresh that *God was with David* (ver. 14), but was departed from him.—Ver. 16. The love of the whole people for him now grew still greater, his consideration rose still higher. This must needs have increased Saul's *fear,* and along with it his envy and jealousy. So Saul's condition of soul is portrayed in progressive development with psychological truthfulness. Of this nothing is said in ver. 5, not a word of Saul's feeling towards David's success. Here, therefore, in vers. 15, 16, we have not the same situation (as if from a different source) as in ver. 5. The difference between them and the advance in the exhibition of Saul's inner life and his attitude towards David is obvious.†

4. Vers. 17–30. *Saul's attempt on David's life* in connection with his marriage with his daughter. In fulfilling his promise to give his daughter to the conqueror of Goliath (xvii. 25), Saul takes occasion to prepare the way for David's death in battle with the Philistines by requiring him to inflict a heavy defeat on them, thus artfully hoping to get rid of him. Such a murderous purpose Saul doubtless had when, after the failure of his murderous attempt in the house, he gave David command over a thousand. A clear light is thus thrown on his new appointment here to a definitely-determined military position.—Ver. 17. "My *oldest* daughter" (Heb. *large,* as in xvi. 11 *small=youngest*). Saul's words: **only be valiant,** *etc.,* are not to be taken as a *condition,* for the condition of receiving Saul's daughter to wife was the conquest of Goliath; but they contain an *obligation* which Saul lays on him, and which David is to accept in return for the honor of becoming Saul's son-in-law. Such exhortation and expectation on Saul's part would not seem strange to David, since *in his continued wars against the Philistines* Saul needed valiant heroes as leaders of his soldiers. It was also in itself perfectly proper for Saul to say to David: "Fight the battle or *wars* of the Lord;" for in thus designating Israel's wars against the Philistines, he expresses the same idea which David expressed in the words (xvii. 36, 47): "He has defied the ranks of the living God," and "The battle is the Lord's." These wars were "the wars of Jehovah," because Israel, whom the Philistines oppressed, was God's chosen covenant-people, in which the kingdom of God was to take shape within the territory contested by the Philistines, in attacking whom, therefore, the Philistines were trying to make void God's purpose of salvation. So must God needs oppose these enemies of His people and of the holy affairs of His kingdom. And this is the meaning of the title of that old collection of songs, Num. xxi. 14: "Book of the Wars of the Lord." And as it was the war of God Himself, the combatants therein were necessarily sure of the Lord's assistance.—But behind this proper language of Canaan was hid Saul's *cunning* and *wickedness* towards David. —**Saul thought: My hand shall not be on him, but the hand of the Philistines shall be on him.**—This "he thought" shows the same disposition in Saul as the same expression [Eng. A. V. "said"] in ver. 11. There he had stretched out hand and spear; but the deed had not come to performance. Here Saul resolves that David shall not die by *his* hand; but guile shall lead him to the desired end. So deep-sunken is he morally and intellectually that he seeks to avoid only the outward completion of the evil deed with his own hand, separates between the criminal *hand* and the wicked *heart,* and besides covers his wickedness with the hypocritical *tongue,* which speaks zealously for the things of the Lord. *Berl. Bib.:* "The finer the words the greater the deceit. Further, he would rather see the Philistines triumph than David survive."—Ver. 18. David's artless simplicity and honest humility are here sharply contrasted with Saul's artfulness and trickiness. As heretofore the struggle between Saul's better and worse impulses and the progress of the latter has been set forth with admirable delicacy and clearness, so now, on the other hand, David's disposition and character is most excellently exhibited by the simple narration of his conduct.—By the question: **Who am I?** David intimates the

* [For a different pointing of the verb—"he lifted," see "Text. and Gram." Erdmann's rendering is allowable, but rare.—Tr.]

† [The separate mention of Israel and Judah in ver. 16 points to the independence and separateness of Judah even at that time (*Bib. Com.*), and perhaps also to a post-Solomonic date for the authorship of the book. —Tr.]

distance between his insignificant *person* as shepherd-lad and the high honor offered him. The question: מִי חַיַּי [Eng. A. V.: "what is my life?"] does not refer to David's *life;* for if it mean his *personal* life, it involves a tautology with the preceding, and reference to his *official* life does not suit the connection, where the point is only of his person and family, apart from the fact that grammatically the personal interrogative pron. [so in the Eng.: "who is my life?"—Tr.] does not suit the noun "life." Nor can it mean in general *position in life;* חַיִּים never means this. Keil, in defence of this view, says, that "מִי refers to the persons of the class of society to which David belonged," in which he admits that it is not the neuter *real* [Germ. *sachliche.*—Tr.] conception "condition of life," but the fundamental meaning of the word "The living" that is here employed; "for מִי *never* refers to *things,* but *always* to *persons*" (Böttcher). The word means here (as חַיָּה in Ps. lxviii. 11; 2 Sam. xxiii. 11, 13) a troop, people, or, from the connection: "*my folks, my family.*" See Ew. § 179 *b*. To this is added: **My father's family.**—In his own eyes David seems too insignificant in person, in family and the House of his father to be son-in-law to the king.*—Ver. 19. "In the time of giving," that is, when she ought to have been given. Ew. § 237 *a:* "When the time is clear from the connection, a future event may be expressed by the Inf. with בְּ." Comp. Deut. xxiii. 14; 2 Kings ii. 2.—Saul did not keep his word; for some reason he gave Merab to *Adriel,* the Meholathite to wife, "which cannot surprise us, considering Saul's capricious disposition in his advanced age" (Stähelin, *Leben Davids,* p. 11). *A place, Abel-meholah,* is mentioned in Judg. vii. 22, in Manasseh, west of the Jordan.—The section vers. 17–19 is arbitrarily omitted in the Sept. because the translators did not understand why Saul failed to keep his promise, and why his action was so contradictory or undecided.—One really does not see why the oscillating, self-contradictory Saul, governed by the momentary whims of his discordant soul, should not have been guilty of such breach of faith. Thenius' confident assertion "that these verses contain nothing but a popular story made out of the fact related in ver. 20 in imitation of Jacob's marriage with Leah and Rachel," is wholly without ground. To such an imitation there is lacking agreement in the chief features of the two narratives.

Vers. 20–30. Michal becomes the wife of David, who issues victoriously out of the great dangers in battle with the Philistines, into which Saul had sent him to a certain death, as he hoped. That it is expressly said of Michal: *She loved David,* does not warrant the conclusion that Merab did not love him, and was therefore not given to him. The reason for this is not mentioned, simply because Saul's procedure was arbitrary. *Perhaps* there was at this moment no war with the Philistines in which he might have looked for David's destruction. It pleased Saul that Michal loved David. Between the transpiring of Michal's love and Merab's marriage we must suppose a space of time, during which Michal's love was developed.—Ver. 21. Michal was to be a *snare* to David, that is, Saul would impose such conditions on him in the marriage as would secure his death: on her account or occasion *the hand of the Philistines* should be *on him* (comp. v. 25):—בִּשְׁתַּיִם [Eng. A. V. in *the one of* the twain," see "Text and Gram."] is literally: *in two* [feminine]. Accordingly it is proposed to render (as Bunsen): David is to make a *double marriage* with Merab and Michal, as Jacob did; in this case (so Tremell.) ver. 19 is to be taken as *Pluperfect:* "*she had been given.*" Similarly, S. Schmid, only he takes ver. 19 in this way, that Saul excused himself to David, and offered to restore Merab to him, she having been already married to another; but if he did not wish this, he should at least marry Michal. Or it is rendered: "Twice shalt thou sue for my alliance"—having failed in Merab's case, thou shalt succeed in Michal's (Cler.); or it is translated in *duabus rebus gener meus eris hodie* [in two things* thou shalt be my son-in-law to-day] (Vulg.), or, "by the second thou shalt contract an alliance with me to-day" (S. Schmid in the 2d ed. of the Bib. Heb. of Ev. v. d. Hooght, Lips., 1740). But all these renderings are materially [that is, as to content; German, *sachlich.*—Tr.] and linguistically untenable. The difficulty lies in their taking the numeral as a cardinal number. But there are passages where it=*the second time,* as undoubtedly in Job xxxiii. 14, and Nehemiah xiii. 20. If now we connect the word with the following (according to the accents), it reads: "a second time wilt thou become my son-in-law," that is, according to the explanation first given by Bunsen: "The first time by the betrothal to Merab (afterwards broken off), the second time by the actual marriage with Michal." Bunsen remarks that this explanation is forced and grammatically hard, as to which (1) *grammatically* the "*second time,*" is justified by the above-cited passages, and (2) as to *content* or meaning this view is far less difficult and suspicious than that preferred by Bunsen, though it must be confessed to be open to the objection that the first marriage did not actually take place.—Keil's explanation: "in a *second way* thou shalt be my son-in-law," is unclear, and the rendering "second way" seems not grammatically sustained.—We escape all the difficulties of a connection with what follows if, with De Wette and Thenius, neglecting the accents (which cannot be finally decisive), we connect with the preceding and translate: "And Saul said to David the *second time*" (understanding the first time to be in ver. 17).—Thenius thinks that the words "And Saul said * * * * to-day" [Eng. A. V. "Saul said * * * * twain"] are an interpolation by the same hand as vers. 17–19, (1) because Saul would not have made the proposition first *himself* and *then* through the courtiers (ver. 22); (2) because he certainly acted only through *others,* the better to conceal his shameful purpose, and (3) because, if *Saul* had spoken first directly to *David,* we should expect also a direct

* [On the text of this verse see "Text. and Gram." Philippson explains: "My life offered in battle would be a poor gift," which, however, the text will hardly bear.—Tr.]

* [That is, by two deeds—killing Goliath and slaying the Philistines (ver. 25.)—Tr.]

answer from David (as in ver. 18). But these three reasons seem insufficient to establish his view; for (1) it does not appear why Saul should not *first* make this proposition *himself*, when we recollect that David returned no answer, and he thought it necessary to employ the agency of the courtiers*; (2) in making the proposition himself he could the better conceal his purpose, as he had not performed his first promise to David, and might now seem to make it good by offering his second daughter; (3) David's experience of deceit was sufficient to make him silent at first in respect to Saul's offer. O. v. Gerlach here well says: "Saul proposed this matter to David; but the latter did not answer, as he knew Saul's vacillation, and distrusted him; it therefore needed the persuasion of others to induce him to come into Saul's views."—Ver. 22 sq. In the fluent discourse of the courtiers we see (1) something of the flattering, conciliatory tone usual in such circles, and (2) Saul's lively interest in the success of his plan to destroy David through Michal's love. Saul's servants were to speak with David "in secret," that is, "as if they did it behind the king's back" (Keil).—*David's answer* (ver. 23) is two-fold: (1) he affirms the great importance of such a step as marrying the king's daughter—referring to the distance between him and the honor for which he was to strive, and probably also herein alluding to Saul's former breach of faith in respect to Merab, which proceeded from contempt for his person; (2) he declares himself too poor to furnish a dowry suitable for a king's daughter. As to the dowry, or "morning-gift," see Gen. xxxiv. 12.—Ver. 25. In consequence of the courtiers' report of David's reasons for declining the marriage, Saul advances another step.† To attain his end he dispenses with the usual dowry, and demands only a hundred foreskins of Philistines (Jos. *Ant.*, vi. 10–27, 600 heads)! It is herein supposed that the Philistines were again attacking Saul. This appears also from the fact that David was in this way to show that he had killed a hundred Philistines, **to avenge the king of his enemies.** Thus Saul thought to put David out of the way by the hand of the Philistines.—Ver. 26. David accepts Saul's proposition the more gladly as the demand was in keeping with his military calling, and he was to win Michal by a heroic achievement. **And the days were not expired**, that is, the time to the marriage, or the time set by Saul for the performance of the warlike deed, though Saul is not expressly said to have set any limit. Ewald explains that the time for the marriage with Merab was not yet expired [so *Bib. Com.*—Tr.]; but it is more natural to refer to the marriage with Michal.—Ver. 27. David marched to battle with **his men**, that is, with the *thousand* which had been assigned him (ver. 13), not with a few valiant followers (as Ewald, Bunsen, and others hold, because with a large body there would have been no danger); we are to suppose that* David attacked a large Philistine force, as is intimated in the words "he slew among the Philistines two hundred men," which he could not have done with a small party. David doubly fulfills Saul's demand by bringing *two hundred* foreskins. And they *counted out the full number*. The arbitrary method of the Sept. is seen in their reading "one hundred" from ver. 25 instead of "two hundred." [Many modern critics, neglecting the spirit of the narrative, prefer the Sept. reading to the Heb., referring also to 2 S. iii. 14. Ignoring the enthusiasm and prowess of David, they insist on an arithmetical correctness in his slaughter, as if a youthful warrior on such an occasion would not rejoice in going beyond the mark. In 2 S. iii. 14 David properly mentions the price demanded by Saul; all beyond was not price, but free gift.—Tr.] Ver. 28 sq. Here, similarly, the Sept. for "Michal, Saul's daughter," puts "all Israel." Bunsen: "A completely unfounded change of the Heb. text," taken from ver. 16. The issue of the hostile schemes set on foot against David is the opposite of what Saul intended. The narrative asserts not only that *God was with David*, but also that Saul knew it. Michal's *love* to David, and Saul's *hate*, which had grown into permanent *enmity*, are here sharply contrasted. "Saul was yet the more afraid" points back to vers. 12–15. Saul's perception of the fact that David was under God's special protection only increased the feeling that he himself was forsaken and rejected by God, who shielded David against his wicked designs.*—Ver. 30 stands in pragmatic connection with the following narrative of Saul's conduct towards David, whose brilliant exploits against the Philistines and rising reputation still more inflamed the jealousy and hatred of Saul.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The history of sin in Saul's inner life shows a steady and rapid progress in evil after it had gained footing and mastery in his heart. When a man once gives place to passion in his soul, he comes more and more into its power, and is at last completely ruled by it, and driven even more violently on from sin to sin. "He that doeth sin is the slave of sin."—*Jealousy*, which, in a heart that has lost God's love and honor as its centre, is born of *selfishness* (wanting all love, honor, joy for itself alone), has always for its companion *envy* of the successes, the honor and the good fortune of others. From *envy* come gradually *hatred* and *enmity*, and then, by hidden or by open ways, *murder*—"he who *hateth* his brother is a *murderer*." Parallel to the example of Saul are those of *Cain* and *Joseph's brothers*.

2. With the deeds which God the Lord performs in the history of his kingdom through chosen instruments, whom He has thereto prepared and enabled by the wise leadings of His grace, are often connected immediate consequences, which (like the consequences of David's victory for him,) are of far-reaching importance

* [That is, David's silence as to Saul's proposition explains why the latter had recourse to his courtiers.—Tr.]

† It is unnecessary to read, with Sept., Vulg., Chald., and others, כִּי אִם, instead of כִּי. Maurer: "Here, as often elsewhere, after a negative, כִּי signifies "but," or rather "for" in this sense: the king desires no dowry, but (for) he desires a hundred Philistine foreskins."

* לֵרֹא contracted from יְרֹא and prefix לְ—Ew. § 328 *c*. Olshausen, *Gr.*, pp. 297, 530, regards it as a clerical error for לִירֹא.

for their further course in life, and provide them with broader and higher equipment of the inner and outer life for greater tasks which are assigned them for the kingdom of God. And the more willingly they thus enter the school of suffering and conflict, as David did, the more do they grow in humility, obedience, and childlike submission to God's will, but the more also do they learn the truth of the word: God gives grace to the humble, He makes the upright to prosper. He who, like David, walks humbly and obediently in God's ways, unmoved by the good fortune granted him, or by the trials and conflicts which often come upon him out of such good fortune through the sins of others, sees himself everywhere led by the Lord's hand, and accompanied by His blessing.

3. True friendship in two souls must be rooted in a like attitude of the heart to a loving God, must exhibit itself in a mutual unselfish devotion of heart in love which is based on a common love to the Lord, and must approve itself in the school of suffering.

4. In the character-pictures which it presents to us (as is clear in the history of Saul and David), Holy Scripture never exhibits a pause in religious-moral life, but always holds up the mighty "Either * * * Or," which man has to decide,—either forward on the way in which man walks at the hand of God with giving up of his own will and humble obedience to the will of God, or backwards with uncheckable step, when man puts God's guidance from him, and, following his own will, suffers not God's will to be accomplished in, on, and through himself.

[Maurice: (*Prophets and Kings of the Old Test.*): I have not tried to ascertain the point at which the moral guilt of Saul ends and his madness begins; the Bible does not hint at a settlement of that question. It is enough for us to know, and to tremble as we know, that the loss of all capacity for discerning between right and wrong may be the rightful and natural result of indulging any one hateful passion. On the other hand, it is comforting to believe that there are conditions of mind to which we must not and dare not impute moral delinquency; a still greater and deeper comfort to know that in these conditions, as well as those where there is most of wilful wrong, God may still be carrying on His great and wonderful work of "bringing souls out of darkness and the shadow of death, of breaking their bonds asunder." There are glimpses of light in the later life of Saul which must be referred to the divine source.

Chandler (*Life of David*, p. 60): David, in the destruction of the Philistines, acted contrary to no rules of religion and morality; for the men he destroyed were the enemies of his country, in a state of actual war with his prince and people, and therefore lawful prize wherever he could lay hold of them.—Tr.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1 sq. J. Lange: To love good people, and that in such a way that one loves and esteems them for the good he sees in them, is a sign that one is good himself.—Schlier: True friendship is a gift of God, and God grants it to those who fear Him.—Berl. Bible: The connection which God establishes between truly converted men is almost indescribable. There is an incomprehensible something that out of two such souls makes a single one in God. No blood relationship or natural friendship comes up to this, because such a union proceeds from utter conformity. When men have experienced such a oneness of soul, they make with each other an *everlasting* covenant.—[Ver. 3. Taylor: A league of friendship, which for sincerity, constancy, and romantic pathos, is unrivalled in the annals of history, whether sacred or profane.—Tr.]

Ver. 4. Schmid: True and genuine love delights to show itself also by outward signs.—Cremer: They are true friends who help not only in prosperity but also in necessity.—F. W. Krummacher: These two loved each other truly in God, to whose service they had devoted themselves in holy hours of consecration, and their views, judgments, opinions and strivings were completely harmonious.—When such conditions concur, there grows up the sweet flower which the apostle, in distinction from universal love, calls "peculiar." There blooms the friendship, which, rooting itself in similarity of sanctified natural disposition, and working an improvement of this on both sides, takes one of the highest places among earthly blessings. There knits itself the communion of heart, in consequence of which one man becomes to another, as it were, a living channel, through which there incessantly streams upon him a fulness of refreshing consolation and encouragement, enriching his inner life.—Ver. 5. Schlier: The Lord makes everything right and good! That God who so wonderfully led David, and even in the least and most trifling things trained him up for his calling, will also lead us by the hand step after step, and if we let ourselves be led, will certainly lead everything to a good result. Let us always hold to the old saying: As God will, hold I still!—Ver. 7. F. W. Krummacher: Let us always celebrate our heroes, perpetuate their memory in monuments, twine laurel crowns for all who have done good service for the common weal, or through their creative gifts have enlarged the domain of elevating and wholesome ideas. Only let us not forget, through whatever of great, noble and blessed is achieved by the sons of man, to be reminded first of the Father of spirits, from whom every good and perfect gift comes down to us, and let us in humility and modesty give to Him, before all others, the honor which is His due.—Ver. 8. Starke: Where prosperity comes, envy soon follows (Gen. xxxvii. 8, Dan. vi. 1–5). [Henry: Now begin David's troubles, and they not only tread on the heels of his triumphs, but take rise from them; such is the vanity of that in this world which seems greatest.—Scott: Lavish commendations of those whom we love and admire, in such a world as this, often prove a real injury.—Tr.]

V. 9. sq. F. W. Krummacher: Were it granted us in our own local circles everywhere to look behind the curtain, who knows how often we too should behold like scenes! Scenes of a wild outpouring of an injured feeling of honor, or of unrestrained vexation at losses, or of flaming and heart-consuming envy, so that we too could

not avoid designating these paroxysms by the expression "demoniacal."—BERL. BIBLE: Selfishness occasions a deadly jealousy, for it makes one grudge the favors which God grants to others.—SCHLIER: If everything had gone on so, if all the people had continually shouted to meet the bold hero, how easily might pride have taken possession of him, how easily might he have fallen from his humility, and become full of vanity and assumption. Therefore God the Lord took him into His own school, and such a school of trouble is indeed bitter, but it is good and wholesome, and he who learns in it first rightly becomes a man after God's own heart.—F. W. KRUMMACHER: Scarcely *one* trying condition of life can be thought of, in which David had not found himself at some time or other during his pilgrimage. Even for his own sake, that he might not be exalted above measure through the abundant favors vouchsafed unto him, he needed continual reminders of his dependence on Him who, on high and in the sanctuary, dwells with those who are of contrite and humble spirit. Besides, David was to become even for thousands of years a loved and comforting companion to the weary and oppressed of every sort, and for that reason, also, no cup of trouble must pass him by untasted.—[SCOTT: For every great and good work a man must expect to be envied by his neighbor; no distinction or preeminence can be so unexceptionably obtained, but it will expose the possessor to slander and malice, and perhaps to the most fatal consequences. But such trials are very useful to those who love God; they serve as a counterpoise to the honor put upon them, and check the growth of pride and attachment to the world; they exercise them to faith, patience, meekness, and communion with God; they give them a fair opportunity of exemplifying the amiable nature and tendency of true godliness, by acting with wisdom and propriety in the most difficult circumstances; they make way for increasing experience of the Lord's faithfulness, in restraining their enemies, raising them up friends, and affording them His gracious protection; and they both prepare them for those stations in which they are to be employed, and open their way to them: for in due time modest merit will shine forth with double lustre.—TR.]—Ver. 10. CRAMER: When one opens the door of his heart to the devil by envy, pride, scorn, sour looks and rudeness, he is not far off, but soon enters in with his hellish forces (Gen. xxxvii. 8, 18 sq.). WURT. SUMM.: How unhappy is a man who has turned away from God, and yet will not acknowledge and confess his guilt, but still assumes that he is in the right! This makes him discontented with God, and grudging and hostile to others who are favored by God.—Ver. 11. STARKE [from BP. HALL]: It is well for the innocent that wicked men cannot keep their own counsel. [HENRY: Compare David, with his harp in his hand, aiming to serve Saul, and Saul, with his javelin in his hand, aiming to slay David; and observe the sweetness and usefulness of God's persecuted people, and the brutishness and barbarity of their persecutors.—TR].—Ver. 12. OSIANDER: God turns away the blows of enemies, so that they are in vain and do no damage.—STARKE: Those who have in God a gracious father and a protector are feared by others (Mark vi. 20).—Ver. 13. S. SCHMID: The evil which ungodly men threaten and do to the pious God knows how to change into something good (Gen. l. 20).—Ver. 15. SCHMID: One can avenge himself on envious men in no better and nobler way, than when with God's help, he behaves himself wisely, and seeks in prayer the increase of the divine blessing.—Ver. 16. STARKE: When ungodly men think to lessen the honor and consideration of the pious, it is often so much the more increased.—CHRYSOSTOM (3 *Homilies on David and Saul*): But that holy man even after all this, continued caring for the other's interests, and incurring perils to promote his safety, and taking place in the ranks in all battles, and preserving by his own perils the one who wished to slay him, and neither in words nor in deeds did he provoke that savage wild beast, but in all things yielded and was obedient.—TR.].

Ver. 17. Friendlier face, worse rogue; therefore try the spirits (Psa. xxviii. 3, lv. 22 [21]). [Saul a hypocritical pretender, both to paternal affection (comp. vers. 20–21), and to pious devotion, "the Lord's battles."—TR.]—OSIANDER: Hypocrites persuade themselves that they have done no evil if only they do not put their own hand to it, although they manage to do it through others.—STARKE: A true Christian must also be a good soldier, and fight the Lord's battles (2 Tim. ii. 5, iv. 7).—Ver. 18. A pious man is even in prosperity humble of heart.—BERL. BIBLE: This humility of David may teach us much. He knew well that he was to be king, and that God had caused him to be anointed thereto; yet he never spoke of such a favor, but rather gives it to be understood how utterly nothing he is, and how unworthy he thought himself.—Ver. 20. SCHLIER: When God does not give us something which we have desired, we should be certain that our wish would not have been good for us, and should be not less certain that God has something better in store for us.—Ver. 22. STARKE: One should not let himself be used for the purpose of causing others to fall.—Ver. 23. BERL. BIBLE: A truly humble man never seeks his own honor, even though opportunities should occur in which he might well do so.—Simplicity and uprightness put all the devices of evil subtlety to shame. And those who always go straight forward often catch those who wanted to catch them.—Ver. 29. OSIANDER: The greater injustice and violence any one does to innocent people, the more must he be afraid of them.

[HENRY: Observe how God brought good to David out of Saul's projects against him. 1. Saul gave him his daughter to be a snare to him, but that marriage made his succeeding Saul less invidious. 2. Saul thought by putting him upon dangerous service to have him taken off, but that very service increased his popularity and facilitated his coming to the crown. Thus God makes the wrath of man to praise Him, and serves His designs of kindness to His own people by it.—TR.]

Vers. 1–2. F. W. KRUMMACHER. *The fruit which David personally gained from his triumph over Goliath* was threefold: a joyful *acquisition*, a perilous *honor*, and a threatening *displeasure*.

[Ver. 12. TAYLOR. *Three lessons* from this chapter: (1) The evil of centering our thoughts and plans entirely on ourselves. This was the root of Saul's misery. (2) The servant of God may expect to encounter adversity in an early stage of his career. (3) The wisest course in time of danger is to do faithfully his daily duty, and leave our case with God.—TR.]

Chap. xviii. DISSELHOFF: *Pleasure and Burden*, or, *Temptation and Victory:* (1) In the pleasure lies the temptation, (2) in the burden lies the power to overcome.

[Vers. 1–4. Jonathan, *the man of generous soul.* (1) Generous in *admiring.* (*a*) Not jealous, though his own military fame is eclipsed. (*b*) Fully appreciating the merit of a new and obscure man. (*c*) Admiring not only a brilliant exploit, but modest, graceful and devout words (David's "speaking," comp. xvii. 37, 45–7, and remember that he was a poet of rare genius). (2) Generous in *proposing friendship*, where he might so naturally have indulged jealousy (as his father did). Love at first sight, seeking permanent union. (HALL: "A wise soul hath piercing eyes, and hath quickly discovered the likeness of itself in another. * * * * That true correspondence that was both in their faith and valor, hath knit their hearts.") (3) Generous in *giving*, what was not only valuable and suitable to his friend's present wants, but honorable as being associated with himself.—Generosity, shown in mutual appreciation and mutual benefits, is the basis of sweet and lasting friendship—and in general, it is one of the noblest traits of human character.

Vers. 1–9. How David gained a *friend* and an *enemy.* (HALL: "David's victory had a double issue, Jonathan's love and Saul's envy, which God so mixed that the one was a remedy of the other.")

Vers. 5–30. David's *prudence.* (1) Amid the perils of sudden prosperity. The shepherd-youth honored with the friendship of the prince, the plaudits of the multitude, military command, the prospect of entering the royal family—but he behaved wisely and prospered all the more. (HENRY: "Those that climb fast have need of good heads and good hearts." HALL: "Honor shows the man. * * * * He is out of the danger of folly, whom a speedy advancement leaveth wise." Comp. Joseph and Daniel.) (2) Amid the plots of jealous rivals—Saul, the courtiers—but he avoids the javelin of rage, and foils the cunning of hypocrisy. (3) Amid provocations to wrath, by promises broken (ver. 19), and fresh demands (25). The brilliant young warrior and poet as prudent as a sage statesman—for *the Lord was with him* (vers. 12, 14, 28).

Ver. 17. The shrinking hand and the scheming heart.

Vers. 28–9. Growing prosperity, growing hate.—TR.]

THIRD SECTION.

Open Deadly Persecution of David by Saul, and David's Flight from Saul.

CHAPTERS XIX.—XXVII.

I. *Jonathan proves his friendship for David in Saul's open attempts on David's life. David's first flight from Saul's murderous attempts, and his escape by Michal's help.*

CHAPTER XIX. 1–24.

1 AND Saul spake to Jonathan his son, and to all his servants that they should
2 kill [about killing[1]] David. But Jonathan, Saul's son, delighted much in David.
And Jonathan told David, saying, Saul, my father, seeketh to kill thee; now,
therefore, I pray thee [and now] take heed to thyself [*ins.* I pray thee] until the
morning [to-morrow morning,[2] *om.* until the], and abide in a secret place, and hide
3 thyself.[3] And I will go out and stand beside my father in the field where thou
art, and I will commune [speak] with [to] my father of thee; and what I see [I

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. This is the literal rendering of the Heb., and so the ancient VSS., except Vulg., which makes "they" the subject of the killing (so Eng. A. V.), and Arab., which correctly makes "he" (Saul) the subject. The context shows that neither to Jonathan nor to the servants of Saul was charge given to slay David.—TR.]

[2] [Ver. 2. Literally: "in the morning." Sept. αὔριον πρωΐ, which Thenius says is the rendering of Heb. מָחָר; but בַּבֹּקֶר, as Wellh. points out, includes the notion "early in the morning."—TR.]

[3] [Ver. 2. Sept. reverses the order and reads: "hide thyself and remain in secret," as if the hiding must precede the dwelling in secret; but the hiding may just as well be regarded as the consequence of dwelling in secret (against Wellh.).—TR.]

4 will see what *he says*] that [and] I [*om.* I] will tell thee. And Jonathan spake
good of David unto Saul his father, and said unto him, Let not the king sin against
his servant, against David; because [for] he hath not sinned against thee, and
5 because [*om.* because] his works have been to thee-ward very good. For [And]
he did put his life in his hand, and slew the Philistine, and the Lord [Jehovah]
wrought a great salvation for all Israel;[4] thou sawest it and didst rejoice; where-
fore, then, wilt thou sin against innocent blood, to slay David without a cause?
6 And Saul hearkened unto the voice of Jonathan, and Saul sware, As the Lord
7 [Jehovah] liveth, he shall not be slain.[5] And Jonathan called David, and Jona-
than showed him all these things. And Jonathan brought David to Saul, and he
was in his presence as in times past.

8 And there was war again, and David went out[6] and fought with the Philistines,
9 and slew them with a great slaughter, and they fled from him. And the [an] evil
spirit from the Lord [Jehovah[7]] was upon Saul; as he sat [and he was sitting] in
his house, with [and] his javelin [*ins.* was] in his hand, and David played [was
10 playing] with his hand. And Saul sought to smite David even [*om.* even] to the
wall with the javelin, but he slipped away [got away] out of Saul's presence, and
he smote the javelin into the wall. And David fled, and escaped that night.[8]
11 Saul also [And Saul] sent messengers unto David's house to watch him, and[9] to
slay him in the morning; and Michal, David's wife, told him, saying, If thou save
12 not thy life to-night, to-morrow thou shalt be slain. So [And] Michal let David
13 down through a [the] window, and he went and fled and escaped. And Michal
took an image [the teraphim],[10] and laid it in the bed, and put a pillow [the quilt]
of goats' hair for his bolster [at its head],[11] and covered it with a cloth [the cover-
14 let]. And when Saul sent messengers to take David, she[12] said, He is sick.
15 And Saul sent the messengers *again* [*om.* again] to see David, saying, Bring him
16 up to me in the bed, that I may slay him. And when the messengers were come
in [And the messengers came in and] behold, *there was* an image[13] in the bed, with
a pillow of goats' hair for his bolster [behold the teraphim in the bed and the quilt
17 of goats' hair at its head[14]]. And Saul said unto Michal, Why hast thou deceived
me so, and sent away mine enemy, that he is escaped? And Michal answered
[said to] Saul, He said unto me, Let me go,[15] why should I kill thee?
18 And David fled and escaped and came to Samuel to Ramah, and told him all

[4] [Ver. 5. Sept.: "all Israel saw and rejoiced," other VSS. as Heb. It is here more fitting and politic in Jonathan to refer to Saul's own knowledge of David.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 6. Sept., Syr. and some MSS. have Qal.: "shall not die."—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 8. Sept. κατίσχυσε, either an explanation (Schleusner), or they read וַיֶּאֱץ (Wellh.); the Heb. is to be maintained.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 9. In this divine name the VSS. vary. The Vat. MS. has θεοῦ, Alex. has κυρίου, text in Stier and Theile's Polygl. (which is an eclectic text) omits it, as does Arab.; the others as Heb. That רָעָה is without the Art. is not decisive in favor of אֱלֹהִים, for *an* evil spirit could as well come from Jehovah as from Elohim (*i. e.* the deity), and may as well be called "a spirit of Jehovah." Elsewhere the Heb. has מֵעִם י׳; but it is at least as probable that the Vat. would change the text to secure uniformity as that the Masorites would change for no reason at all. See note on xvi. 14.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 10. On this reading see Erdmann in the Exposition.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 11. Wellhausen (following Sept.) objects to the "and" on the ground that the two actions (of watching and killing) are not here co-ordinated, the killing not being entrusted to the watchers. This is perhaps an unnecessary refinement, ver. 14 being possibly a repetition of this statement, not necessarily a sending of additional messengers. Yet, as Saul sends in ver. 14 apparently to take, not to kill David, the reference of the killing here to Saul and the omission of the ו (which may have been repeated from the preceding word) give a good sense.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 13. "Teraphim" is a plu. word, but is here used in the Heb. as sing.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 13. The Eng. A. V. renders "bolster" to correspond to its above rendering "pillow." The Heb. means simply "at its head;" the exact use which Michal made of the quilt is not clear.—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 14. The Sept. has "they said," that is, the people of the house, the servants, speaking with the messengers at the door. But the Heb. text is perfectly natural: either it means Michal sent word, that is, said through her servants, or, if she herself spoke with the messengers, she reported David sick to gain time, having meantime prepared the bed to deceive her own servants (whose fidelity she might doubt) or Saul's messengers in case they should go to look for David.—The Vulg. has the indefinite *responsum est.*—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 16. תְּרָפִים, teraphim. Chald., Syr., Arab., Vulg., render "image." Sept. has κενοτάφια, "cenotaphs, empty tombs," a contemptuous designation of the vanity of the idols, Aq. gives μορφώματα or προτομαί, the latter (meaning "half figures") being important as bearing on the form of the teraphim.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 16. מְרַאֲשֹׁתָיו, from רֹאשׁ or רֵאשָׁה by the local preformative מְ. The plu. would be properly מְרַאֲשׁוֹת (see Jer. xiii. 18) as from מְרַאֲשָׁה. Comp. Ew., Gr. § 160 *b*, Fürst's Concordance *s. v.*—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 17. Or: "send me away." The verb is fem. in many MSS. and Edd.—Tr.]

that Saul had done to him. And he and Samuel went and dwelt in Naioth.[16]
19, 20 And it was told Saul, saying, Behold David is at Naioth in Ramah. And
Saul sent messengers to take David; and when they saw the company[17] of the pro-
phets prophesying, and Samuel standing *as* appointed [as leader] over them, the
Spirit of God was [came] upon the messengers of Saul, and they also prophesied.
21 And when [*om.* when] it was told Saul, [*ins.* and] he sent other messengers, and
they [*ins.* also] prophesied likewise [*om.* likewise]. And Saul sent messengers
22 again the third time, and they prophesied also [also prophesied]. Then [And]
went he also [he also went] to Ramah, and came to a [the] great well [cistern][18]
that is in Sechu.[19] And he asked and said, Where are Samuel and David? And
23 one said, Behold, they be [are] at Naioth in Ramah. And he went thither to
Naioth in Ramah; and the Spirit of God was [came] upon him also, and he went
24 on and prophesied until he came to Naioth in Ramah. And he [*ins.* too] stripped
off his clothes also [*om.* also] and [*ins.* he too] prophesied before Samuel in like
manner [*om.* in like manner], and lay down naked all that day and all that night.
Wherefore they say, Is Saul also among the prophets?

[16] Ver. 18. So the Qeri, but the Kethib is Nevaioth.—Tr.]

[17] [Ver. 20. So universally taken (—קהלת). Lud. de Dieu, however, refers to the Æth. stem להק—*crescere*, whence he thinks our word may mean *magnum numerum*, or, *senatum*, *presbyterium Prophetarum*. In Æth. the word represents only magistracy, superiority (Dillmann, *Lex. Æth.*), which does not suit here.—Tr.]

[18] [Ver. 22. The word is anarthrous, and so far supports the Sept.: "the cistern of the threshing-floor" (Wellh.), as this construction is unusual; but that it is not unexampled is shown by 2 Sam. xii. 4; 1 Kings vii. 8, 12, and would be not unnatural here in speaking of a well-known cistern, where בּוֹר might almost have the force of a proper name. The addition of Sept at beginning of ver. 22: "and Saul became very angry," is suspicious because of its naturalness.—Tr.]

[19] [Ver. 22. Sept. Σεφί, Ar. Ramah. The Heb. is to be preferred.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1–7. Warding off through Jonathan's mediation of the first open outbreak of Saul's deadly enmity to David.

Ver. 1. Saul advances so far in his deadly hate towards David that he speaks openly to his courtiers of his purpose to kill him. The "killing" [Eng. A. V. is wrong, see Text. and Gram.—Tr.] refers not to Jonathan and Saul's servants, but to Saul himself.—Ver. 2. Jonathan shows his friendship for David 1) in informing him of Saul's designs on his life, and counselling him to conceal himself, and 2) in interceding for him with Saul, and trying to turn away his anger (ver. 3), in which he succeeds.—In thus attempting to restore friendly relations between his father and David, Jonathan's aim was to keep David at court for the welfare of his father and the people, because he saw in David a specially chosen instrument of the Lord for the welfare of Israel, as he expressly declares in ver. 4. (דִּבֵּר with בְּ as in Ps. lxxxvii. 3; Deut. vi. 7: "to speak concerning one." Ew., § 217, 2.)—David is to hide *in the field*, as we infer from Jonathan's saying that he will speak with his father in the field where David is. The place designated by Jonathan was perhaps one to which Saul used often to go, or where he was accustomed to hold confidential and private conversations. To "what" [see Text. and Gram.—Tr.] we must supply "*he says*" or "*I hear*" (Vulg.: *et quodcunque videro tibi nuntiabo* [so Eng. A. V.]). Against De Wette's translation: "what it is," Thenius properly urges that Jonathan already knew what Saul then had in mind. Against Thenius' view that David was to hide near Saul in order to hear what he said is the fact that Jonathan himself says to David: "I will tell thee." Rather we must suppose with Keil that Jonathan made this arrangement in order that he might tell David the result of the conversation immediately, without having to go far from his father, and thus awaken suspicion of an understanding with David.—Vers. 4, 5. Jonathan's statement to Saul is three-fold: 1) he spoke *good* of David, that is, he spoke favorably of him, pointing out his excellent qualities and his services to Saul and the nation; 2) on the ground of this he implored Saul not to sin against his *servant*. This designation of David as his *servant* accords with the foregoing reference to the *good* which David, as Saul's faithful servant, had done; 3) to this he adds *two reasons*, a *negative*: "*he hath not sinned against thee*," that is, he has done nothing to call forth thy vengeance; and a *positive*: "*his works are very useful to thee*," that is, far from doing thee harm, he hath done thee only great service by his deeds.—The relation of ver. 5 to the latter part of ver. 4 is this, that Jonathan, continuing his mediation, here reminds his father of the *deed* which is *specially* to be taken into consideration, the slaying of the Philistine, and how he had therein ventured his life: "he put his life in his hand"* (xxviii. 21; Judg. xii. 2), risked his life (perhaps alluding to David's hand, which swung the sling against the giant, on the firmness and certainty of which his life depended).—Jonathan then proceeds to point out how serviceable to Saul this deed of David was: **and the Lord wrought a great salvation for all Israel; thou sawest it and didst rejoice.** This reminder of Saul's joy at David's exploit (seen with his own eyes) and its grand results,

* [The Heb. (כַּף) means the "palm or hollow of the hand," as the proper place in which to put something, usually the hand as receptacle, not as instrument.—Tr.]

this vivid presentation of the situation at that time is the psychological stepping-stone to the ethical change which is brought about in Saul's attitude towards David by Jonathan's pressing and yet modest supplication: **Why wilt thou sin against innocent blood, to slay David without cause?**—Saul was changeable and uncertain in his unstable inner life, because there was yet in him a noble germ whence good fruit might yet come.—Ver. 6. **Saul swore**, a characteristic indication of his to go to one extreme or another. David's life was now saved. [Some think that Saul swore insincerely, to put Jonathan off his guard; but this is not so probable as that he was here sincere, but fell again under the power of jealousy (ver. 10).—Tr.].—Ver. 7. Jonathan, having performed this friendly service for David, informs him of the result according to promise (ver. 3), and David resumes his place at court. David was in Saul's presence "as yesterday and the day before," that is, as in times past.

Vers. 8–17. *David's first flight* in consequence of another murderous attempt on Saul's part, the result of envy and jealousy.

Ver. 8. The background of this narrative is formed by the military life which was connected with the continued wars with the *Philistines*. The "*went out*" is not to be changed into some other word (with Then. after Sept. κατίσχυσε), but to be retained (as in xviii. 5, 16) as expressing David's marching forth to battle.—Ver. 9. The *ethical* ground of Saul's *new* outburst of rage after David's success is his envy and jealousy of David's honor and glory, as is intimated by the preceding mention of the latter's victory over the Philistines.—"We have two similar accounts of Saul's outbreaks (xviii. 10 sq. and xix. 9 sq.) simply because such outbreaks were really frequent (comp. especially xviii. 18) and like one another" (Nägelsbach in Herz. XIII. 403). **An evil Spirit of Jehovah came upon Saul.**—While this evil spirit is in xvi. 15 and xviii. 10 referred to Elohim, the Deity in general, *Jehovah* is here affirmed to be its sender, because Saul's condition, which was *there* only ascribed in general to a higher divine causality in respect to his *person*, is *here* regarded as a judgment of the *covenant-God* of Israel on the reprobate *king*, who hardens his heart against God.—Along with his military calling, David here again takes his old place as harpist. He did not abandon the post assigned him by the Lord, so long as the Lord did not through events command him to leave it, as was afterwards the case, cf. ch. xx.—The Sept. took offence at the "evil spirit of Jehovah" and left out "Jehovah."* But the Genitive means nothing more than what is said in xvi. 14, that the God of Israel sent an evil spirit on Saul, or gave him over to the power of the evil spirit.—Ver. 10. David escapes Saul's spear, which penetrates the wall. He flees **the same night**. (The Art. of the Pron. is lacking from similarity of sound, Ew. § 392 *a*, and § 70 *c*). The Sept. reads: "and it came to pass that night that Saul sent" (inserting וַיְהִי and connecting with the following), looking to ver. 12, where the flight by night is first mentioned. Against this it is not necessary to insist that the narrator here in Hebrew fashion gives the result first by anticipation, and then details the immediate incidents; for Saul's attempt may have occurred in the evening, or, if it happened in the day-time, David may first have hidden in Saul's house, and then at night have fled to his own house. That David fled to his own dwelling and remained there till night, appears from ver. 11, according to which Saul sends messengers to his house to watch him and to kill him in the *morning* (that is, when he went out again). With this agrees exactly the fact that Michal, who acquainted him with the danger threatening him in his house, presses him to flee that night, because *in the morning* he would be slain. In the night of the same day on which the attempt on his life occurred, David fled from Saul's house to his own, and the same night by Michal's means he fled from his own house. [Kitto: "We may guess that only the fear of alarming the town, and of rousing the populace to rescue their favorite hero, prevented him from directing them to break into the house and slay David there." Others suggest the fear of alarming or injuring Michal. She could easily get notice of Saul's design from Jonathan or others.—Tr.]

Ver. 12. **Through the window**, because the door was watched (ver. 11) by Saul's men. For similar escapes through windows see Josh. ii. 15; Acts ix. 25; 2 Cor. xi. 33.—With this flight of David began his weary fleeing before Saul, and the great sufferings and dangers which he encountered in this unsettled life.—Ver. 13. By a trick with the *Teraphim* Michal deceives Saul's catchpolls.—The *teraphim* were the images of domestic or private gods (Penates) which the Israelites retained as the remnant of the idolatry brought from the Aramæan or Chaldean home (Gen. xxxi. 19, 34) in spite of their removal after the entry of Jacob's family into Canaan (Gen. xxxv. 2 sq.) and of the absolute prohibition of idolatry in the Law, which reappear especially in the period of the Judges (Judg. xvii. 5; xviii. 14 sq.) and particularly meet us in the houses of Saul and David in spite of Samuel's prophetic zeal against such idolatry (1 Sam. xv. 23; comp. Hos. iii. 4; Zech. x. 2). The Plu. here represents a *single* image, which it seems (ver. 16) must have had the human form at least as to head and face, though the size may have varied, since (Gen. xxxi. 30 sq.) it was so small that Rachel could conceal it under the camel-saddle, while Michal here uses it to make Saul's men believe that David was in the bed. The teraphim which Laban calls his "Elohim" were probably originally tutelar deities, dispensers of domestic and family good fortune. On the derivation and meaning of the name see Rödiger in Ges. Thes. III. 1520, Hävernick on Ezek. p. 347 sq., and Delitzsch Gen. II. p. 220 [and Art. "Teraphim" in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*—Tr.].* On the *meaning* see particularly the Arts. in Winer and Herzog. Whether it was a wooden image is uncertain, as also, whether Michal had such domestic gods on account of her barrenness (Michaelis, Thenius, Keil). כְּבִיר (which the Sept. read כָּבֵד "liver," whence Joseph says that Michal put a palpitating goat-

* [See "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

* [See other opinions in Poole's Synopsis on Gen. xxxi. 19, and in Patrick's Comm. here.—Tr.]

liver into the bed to represent a breathing sick man) is from כָּבַר ["to braid"] and means *woven-work* or *net* [rendered *quilt* or *mattress*, Eng. A. V. *pillow*.—Tr.]. The plural of "goat" (עֵז) here = goats' hair. The Def. Art. points to something which belonged to the furnishing of a couch or bed.* **She put it at his head**, which may mean either that she put a woven cover under his head, or a hairy cover on or around his head. In any case Michal's purpose was to make the head of the teraphim look as much as possible like a human head. The בַּבֶּגֶד ["with the coverlet"] must, on account of the article, be understood of some piece of household stuff, therefore of the *bed-cover*. The word (בֶּגֶד) means the *upper garment* of the Oriental, which is a wide cloth thrown around the person, and served also for bed-clothing.—Ver. 14. When Saul's messengers come the first time, Michal says to them that David is sick. [On this untruth see "Histor. and Theolog." to this chap. at end.—Tr.].—Ver. 15. Saul, determined to carry out his purpose orders David to be *brought up* to him on the bed, that is, to his house, which, therefore, was higher than David's. "Saul must therefore have resided in *Gibeah* on the height" (Then.).—Ver. 16. The messengers come and discover the deceit. The express mention of the "goat-hair cover at his head" shows that this had materially contributed to the success of the deception. It appears from ver. 13 that to the words [of the Heb.]: "behold teraphim in the bed," we must supply "laid" or "placed."—Ver. 17. Saul demands an explanation of Michal. **Why hast thou sent away my enemy?**—In these words appears all Saul's bitterness and blindness. It is a sort of "persecuting mania" that shows itself in David's persecutor. —Michal's defence does not agree with the statement in vers. 11, 12, that she herself urged David to flight. From fear of her father she tells a "lie of necessity," saying: "He said to me, send me away, why should I kill thee?" She pretends that she wished to prevent his flight, but he threatened to kill her if she stood in his way. [To this deliverance is referred Ps. lix. by its title and Ps. vii. by some critics.—Tr.]

Vers. 18–24. *David's flight to Ramah to Samuel.*

Ver. 18. **David told Samuel all that Saul had done to him.**—That David takes refuge in Samuel's quiet seat of the prophets is explained by the intimate connection which David already had with Samuel and the prophetic school presided over by him, and especially by the official-theocratic connection which David's anointing had brought about between the two men. Samuel now becomes God's instrument for saving and preserving David as the Lord's Anointed from the attempts of Saul. David dwelt "at *Naioth*" with Samuel, who *went thither* with him. Naioth is to be distinguished from *Ramah*, Samuel's dwelling-place, and to be regarded as a place where Samuel stayed as long as David, who had at first reported to him at Ramah, was with him (comp. vers. 22, 23). The Kethib has everywhere Nevaioth, Vulg. (with Qeri) Naioth. The appellative, signifying "dwellings," became the proper name of the place where dwelt the prophets who gathered about Samuel as their head (comp. ver. 20). The plu. form indicates a colony consisting of several dwellings, a prophetic cenobium.*—Vers. 19, 20. Saul, having been informed of David's stay in this cenobium, sent messengers to fetch him.† The prophets‡ here appear 1) in an assembly, 2) therein engaged in prophesying, and 3) under the lead of Samuel. It is to be noted that we have here *prophets*, who in inspired discourse give forth their inner life filled with the Holy Ghost, not *sons* of the prophets, as in 2 Kings iv. 38; vi. 1, who as scholars and learners sit at the feet of their master and teacher. The prophetic community here, therefore, under Samuel as *head* is not yet a prophetic *school*, to educate young men for the prophetic calling, but is a prophetic *seminary*, in which, under Samuel's guidance in an externally strictly ordered yet internally free association, the prophetic powers are practiced and strengthened, mutually incite, nourish, and further one another, and the prophetic charisma finds ever new nourishment and new growth by this common holy discipline. **And the Spirit of God came upon the messengers of Saul**; Spirit of God, not Spirit of Jehovah, because we here have not to do with the Spirit of the *covenant-God*, but with the supernatural principle of inspiration. **And they too prophesied.** Clericus: "They sang divine praises, being seized on by a sudden afflatus which they could not resist (as Saul, x. 10), so that they no longer had control over themselves." The condition of Saul's messengers is that of ecstatic ravishment, into which they were brought by the overpowering might of the inspired song or word of the prophets.—Ver. 21. Saul's second and third companies of messengers fall into a similar ravishment. [The repeated occurrence of this supernatural seizure adds greatly to the force and effectiveness of the narrative. The purpose of this in the divine providence, we may suppose, was to bring Saul himself.—Tr.]—Ver. 22. **Then went he also to Ramah and came** (on the way thither) **to the great cistern** (well known, as

* [On the character of the bed (here a separate *couch*, not the oriental *divan*) see Philippson *in loco*, and Works on Archæology.—Tr.]

* [Chald. renders "house of instruction," and in ver. 20 "scribes." Smith's *Bib.-Dict.*, Art. Naioth.—Tr.]

† The Sing. וַיַּרְא is surprising. According to Ewald, § 316 *a*, 1, the Verb or Adj., when it stands as one half of the sentence *before* the *yet unnamed* (and not clearly conceived) subject, may remain in the most indefinite Pers., the masc. sing., as in 1 Kings xxii. 36; Josh. viii. 20; Gen. i. 14; Mic. vi. 16, *etc.*; but when the subject has been named, this indefiniteness cannot exist. The Sing. must therefore be here regarded as a corruption, and we must read (with Ew., Then., and all vss.) the Plu.—The word לַהֲקַת, which sounds remarkably like the preceding לָקַחַת here from the connection—assembly—קְהִלַּת. It appears here only, and is to be regarded as a transposition (so the Greek and several Rabbis) of the word meaning "assembly," occasioned by the similar sound of the preceding לָקַחַת.

‡ [Chald: "They saw the company of the scribes praising and Samuel standing over them teaching."—Tr.]

the Art. shows) **that was in Sechu.**—a now unknown region or locality near Ramah. The Sept. has "cistern of the threshing-floor" (גֹּרֶן) instead of "great" cistern, and "on the hill" (שְׁפִי) instead of "Sechu." But, though it is true that threshing-floors were usually on hills, there is no need here of a change of text.* Saul, learning that David and Samuel were at Naioth in Ramah, went thither.—Ver. 23. While he was still in the way there happened to him what happened to his messengers. **The Spirit of God came upon him also, and he went on and prophesied till he came to Naioth in Ramah.** The difference between Saul and his messengers was simply that the inspiration came on him as he was approaching the residence of the prophet, and that it attained a higher grade and lasted longer, completely suppressing his self-consciousness.—Ver. 24, namely, relates: **And he too stripped off his clothes, and he too prophesied before Samuel.** The throwing off of the clothing was the effect of the heat of body produced by internal excitement. Abarbanel: "because of inward warmth, and to spread the garments out." We may suppose that the messengers also cast away their garments (though it is not expressly so said), as the prophets in their times of excitement and heat may well have done. The "he also" is not found in the following sentence: **he lay naked all day and all night.** This does not necessarily mean complete nakedness (עָרֹם, 2 Sam. vi. 20), because there was worn under the kethoneth or tunic a fine woven shirt of linen or cotton (סָדִין, Judg. xiv. 12 sq.; Isa. iii. 23), and over it a long sleeveless outer garment (מְעִיל, xviii. 4; xxiv. 5–12). Comp. Keil, *Bibl. Arch.*, II., 39.—Saul lay in his under-garment (a sort of shirt which was next to the body, but did not completely cover it) *unconscious;* so completely was he overcome by the ecstacy. **Wherefore they say, Is Saul also among the prophets?** See ch. x. 11, 12, where the origin of this saying is related. Here we have not the origin, but the application of the already existing proverb.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The picture of a *true, faithful friend,* already presented to us in Jonathan, is here completed in the account of his conduct towards Saul and David in individual significant traits and clear colors; but at the same time *along with this picture of noble friendship* we find one of an humble, reverent, childlike spirit towards the sinful purpose of his father. As soon as Jonathan has learned from his father the danger that threatened David's life, he shows his faithful love for his friend by imparting to him the evil designs of his father, by enjoining on him to hide himself, by promising to soften if possible his father's wrath, and by informing him how he (David) should soon learn the result of his effort at mediation and rescue. But Jonathan's noble character appears in yet clearer light in his conduct towards his father. For his friend's sake he dares, at the risk of his life, to oppose the rage and the sinister designs of his own father. Openly and frankly he represents to his father the great crime he would commit by slaying David. His heart is free from envy and jealousy while he sets before his father David's great services to the royal house and the whole nation. His words and bearing show manly firmness and decision, and yet childlike piety, reverence, and obedience; no word not in keeping with the Fourth Commandment from his lips. And in addition to all this is his magnanimous self-denial, since he doubtless suspected that his friend would ascend the throne after his father. Though he himself possessed all the qualities which should adorn God's Anointed on the throne, heroic courage, undisputed, universally acknowledged military renown, firm trust in the living God, and a noble disposition, he shows not the slightest trace of envy and unkindness towards David. "Notwithstanding all this he was not only nobly ready, if the Lord should so command, to give up his birthright, but strove wisely and vigorously to defeat all that was conceived and undertaken against God's decree, even at the risk of falling by his own father's hand, a sacrifice to his piety and friendship" (F. W. Krummacher). Jonathan is a character that rises on the platform of Old Testament-life in peculiarly noble, harmonious, ethical-sympathetic form, whether we regard him as the heroic warrior and leader, or as faithful, self-denying friend, or as humble, modest prince-royal, or as the frank, unshrinking denouncer of wrong and sin.

2. In *David's* ethical-historical character, as presented to us in this section, we have to note in the first place his *humble and obedient behaviour* in the *calling* appointed him by the divine providence at the royal court, in spite of the quickly changing and fiercely outbreaking passionate moods of Saul, and in spite of the dangers which he saw threatened him. Every moment he put himself at the king's disposition, and was at his side to help him whenever it was necessary. He went quietly on the way which the Lord had appointed him. And therefore he was under God's protection, and experienced the preserving help of his God.—Yet this flight, in which his wife's faithful love was the Lord's means of saving him, began the *unbroken series of severe sufferings and trials* by which David was to be confirmed in his faith and trained in a hard school for his royal calling. In this long life of suffering he had uninterrupted experience as a confirmed servant of God of the help, the consolation, the strengthening from above to which his Psalms bear testimony. Roos: "Lay David's good and bad fortune in the balances. A courtier and officer, who falls under the king's displeasure, whom the king with implacable rage seeks to kill, whom the courtiers and many others, to please the king, despise and persecute, a man who is compelled to flee, who in need and affliction must always conceal himself, who can often find no place on earth where to lay his head, such a man may well talk of misfortune, and is in this view a miserable person. But if we remember that God in his deepest needs vouchsafes gracious visitations to the soul of this man, lifts it, as it were, above all mists and clouds, grants it clearest insight into truth, refreshes it by undeceptive addresses and friendly consolations, and through it points all men to happiness, we must admit

* [See "Text. and Gram." The Vat. Sept. reads Sephi, not "on the hill."—Tr.]

that this man's good fortune is greater than his bad fortune, that his honor is greater than his reproach, and that the good that he has superabundantly makes up for all his outward want."

2. *The title of the 59th Psalm* refers its origin to David's dangerous situation in Gibeah, "when Saul sent and they watched the house to kill him." And in fact the recurring verses 7 and 15 [6 and 14] of this very artistically arranged Psalm point to ambushments which begin in the evening. But it is repeated ambuscades that are there spoken of. Since now in our history only *one* night is mentioned, it seems more appropriate not to refer this Psalm to those dangerous days in Gibeah (Delitzsch, Moll), but with Hengstenberg to find its occasion in David's remembrance of the deliverance wrought that night through Michal, which was the beginning of the weary flight, wherein he encountered such unspeakable dangers and sufferings. "Such being the importance of the fact, we should expect David to perpetuate its recollection by a Psalm" (Hengst.). The Psalm was sung when he looked back on the long line of enemies' snares and divine deliverances, of which the events of that evening and night were the beginning and type. We must not, however, confine ourselves to that event *alone*, but must include all David's similar experiences of Saul's traps. "From the Psalm it appears only that it was called forth by an attempt on the singer's life; in other respects the circumstances are those which belong in general to the Saul-period" (Hengst.).*

4. *The teraphim-image*, which Michal employs, shows that these Aramæan idols, these forms of "strange gods" which Rachel took secretly from her father's house (Gen. xxxi. 19, 34)—in spite of their burial by Jacob (Gen. xxxv. 2 sq.), and their ordered removal by Joshua (Josh. xxiv. 22) and Samuel's zealous opposition to them (1 Sam. xv. 23)—hid in the privacy of domestic life, whence in the time of the Judges they came openly forth (Judg. xvii. compared with xviii. 14 sq.), still maintained themselves. As the teraphim were oracular deities in their old homes (so in Ezek. xxi. 21 Nebuchadnezzar inquires through them whether he shall march against Jerusalem or against Ammon), so also in Israel (Judg. xvii. 18; 1 Sam. xv. 23; Hos. iii. 4; Ezek. xxi. 26; Zech. x. 2) they were superstitiously used as oracles, counsel being asked through them concerning the future. Hävernick (on Ezek. xxi. 26): "The use of the teraphim as oracles came no doubt through their connection with the Ephod (comp. Hos. iii. 4; Zech. x. 2), the ancient general notion of their magical power passing over into the more special one of prediction." Under Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 24) their removal was decreed in connection with other idolatrous abominations, but they kept their place till the Exile.

5. In respect to the *history* and *theocratic significance* of the so-called *Schools of the prophets*, we must distinguish the two *periods* in which, in point of fact, the only mention of them occurs. In the first place we meet with prophetic *unions* or prophetic *communities* in the age of Samuel, which are more exactly defined during his relations with Saul: first that band of prophets (x. 5, 10), which in Gibeah descends from the sacrificial hill and meets Saul, prophesying with music and song. Perhaps this community resided in Gibeah, in support of which we may perhaps with Keil adduce the name "Gibeah of God." In ch. xix. the prophetic community stands in a near relation to Samuel as the "president." The members are called Nebiim (prophets]; they prophesy under Samuel's lead; their inspiration (as in ch. x.) is so mighty that persons that do not belong to them, as Saul's servants and Saul himself, are seized and overpowered by it, and fall into a like ecstacy. David is closely connected with them, as is shown by his flight to them and stay with them. He found there only temporary safety indeed from Saul's persecutions, but abiding consolation and strength in the inspired prophetic word, in the blessings of the fraternal community, and in the consoling and elevating power of the holy poetic art, whereby he doubtless stood in peculiarly intimate connection with the community. The members of the body formed a Cenobium; their outward life of union symbolized their inward union under the mighty impulse of one and the same Spirit, the Holy Spirit, a union which they saw accomplished through this prophetic Spirit which informed them all. In point of fact we find certainly at this time such an organized prophetic community only in Ramah; whether Samuel, who was its president there in the latter part of his life, was also the establisher of the form of associated life, is doubtful; but in any case it may be confidently maintained that through the powerful influence which he exerted on his contemporaries by the prophetic Spirit which dwelt and worked in him, awakening and fashioning a new life, this Spirit, which in its essential nature tended to produce association, showed itself in such unions of prophetic men. The original power and vigor of this Spirit expresses itself in these extraordinary phenomena and overwhelming effects, just as in the Apostolic church they appear as the fruit of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (Acts ii.; 1 Cor. xiv.).—The theocratic significance of this association consisted in the fact that, along with Samuel's lofty prophetical form, they were the centre and source of the reviving religious-moral life of the nation, after it had lost its theocratic centre in the national sanctuary, which was despoiled of the ark of the covenant. The prophetic men of this community, which is by no means to be regarded as an association of pupils, represent the manifold theocratic-prophetic influence on the people, which was first completely brought to bear by Samuel's labors; they form, when Samuel's life is approaching its end, the aftergrowth (nurtured by him) of the combined divinely-appointed theocratic office of prophet and judge (alongside of the royal office), as bearers of which we find the prophets in David's time. In their midst originated and was cultivated the theocratic-prophetic writing of history, as representatives of which a Gad (comp. xxii. 5) and a Nathan are mentioned along with Samuel (1 Chr. xxix. 29). Comp. Thenius on 1 Sam. xix. 19 and xxii. 5.—On the prophetic schools under Samuel see Oehler in *Herz. R.-E., s. v. Prophetenthum des A. T.*, XII. 214–217.

* [The way in which this Ps. contrasts Israel and the heathen makes it difficult to refer it to this incident in David's life; and it is the city, not the house that the enemy here surrounds. The title is not necessarily part of the inspired Psalm.—Tr.]

The history is silent concerning the prophetic communities during the whole period from Samuel to the age of *Elijah* and *Elisha*. Not till the epoch in the development of the prophetic Order in Israel marked by the grand prophetic characters of Elijah and his successor Elisha do we again meet with these communities, and then only in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes at *Gilgal*, *Bethel*, and *Jericho*, in which places there was a numerous membership (2 Kings iv. 38; ii. 3, 5, 7, 15, 16; iv. 1, 43; vi. 1; ix. 1); here, however, they are not called "prophets" as under Samuel's lead, but *sons of the prophets* (1 Kings xx. 35), a name which indicates that they stood to the leaders and presidents of the communities in a dependent relation as scholars and disciples. They have their places of assembly and abode, designed for a large number, where they sit at the feet of their prophetic masters (comp. 2 Kings vi. 1 sq.), and receive prophetic instruction and cultivation. Only such can we properly call prophetic *schools*, whose prophetic presidents and leaders (as Elisha's case shows) had to legitimate themselves by the power of the prophetic spirit dwelling in them. While under Samuel's presidency the prophetic communities appear as freer associations of prophetic men for the exertion of united influence on the people, these later ones are distinct Unions, in which teachers and scholars, masters and disciples stand in a relation of mutual co-ordination [control and subordination]. The subject-matter of the instruction was the divine law and the history of the divine dealings with the covenant people; the aim of the instruction was the nurture and furtherance of the prophetic spirit by holy discipline in an organized God-serving life. The pupils were trained in unconditional obedience to the divine law, in living appropriation of the holy will of God as absolute norm for their own wills; from their Cenobia thus equipped they went forth among the people to testify of the living God, of His word and His righteous and gracious dealings, and with absolute obedience to perform the special tasks imposed on them by the masters with divine authority (comp. 1 Kings xiii. 20 sq.). Besides this general theocratic significance these Unions had the special duty to form the centre of the service of God for the people in their separation from the sanctuary at Jerusalem (comp. 2 Kings iv. 23, 42), and in the prophetical work of their members to oppose a solid power to the heathenism which pressed in on the people under an idolatrous government, and to maintain the honor of the living God. Comp. Oehler *ubi supra*, p. 220 sq.—In respect to the historical continuity of such prophetic associated life in the interval between the prophetic communities of Samuel and these later schools of the prophets, nothing can be certainly determined, although, as Oehler shows against Keil (as above, p. 215), the great number of prophets, which, according to 1 Kings xviii. 13, must have existed when Elijah appeared, seems to favor such continuity. Comp. on the other side Keil's remarks in his commentary on ch. xix. p. 147 sq. [*Eng. Transl.*, pp. 199–205.]

[Michal's deception in ver. 13 may be called a stratagem, her statement in ver. 14 is a falsehood carrying out the stratagem, and her answer to her father in ver. 17 is, as Erdmann terms it, a "lie of necessity;" that is, a lie held to be necessary, in order to save one from suffering or perplexity. Clearly this last is unjustifiable; when Saul demanded an explanation Michal ought to have answered that she thought it right to save her husband. Her stratagem (ver. 13) may be defended on the ground that Saul, in assuming the position towards David of an open enemy (without legal warrant), having previously tried to kill him, had thus put himself out of ordinary relation with him, and was to be treated as a public enemy or a madman. Whether the statement in ver. 14 is then properly a part of the stratagem is not so easy to say. The decisive question is: Was it necessary to the success of the stratagem? was it based on Saul's abnormal, unnatural, criminal attitude towards David?—Tr.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 1–4. Berl. Bible: So far is Saul carried by *self-love*, which often transforms itself into fury against the friends of God, and it is incredible how far it can go wrong. Jonathan acted as a true friend to David, and presents therein a picture of a faithful and upright friend, who not only warns David of danger and gives him good counsel, but also at his own peril speaks to his father for him, declares his innocence and praises his noble services, and thereby brings him again into his father's favor.—Schlier: Even in grown persons there is nothing more beautiful than reverence for parents, and doubly beautiful is this ornament when one thing is understood, how to lead parents away from sin and yet in so doing always show modesty and respect, when one thing is understood, how to fulfil the Fourth Commandment in truth and love. [Taylor: Such a manifestation of prudence and principle combined. Prudence did not go so far as to make him silent about the sin which Saul was purposing to commit; principle was not so asserted as to arouse his father's indignation.—Tr.].—Ver. 6 sqq. Berl. Bible: A kindly and hearty, an humble but also righteous opposition is suited to turn away the evil that has been resolved on and hinder it from coming to the birth.—Schlier: Open thy mouth for thy neighbor, and stand up for him, excuse him where thou canst, speak to his advantage wherever it is possible, let it be a joy to thee to bring to light his good side, be in earnest to promote peace wherever it is practicable.

Ver. 8. Berl. Bible: O my God, how wonderfully dost Thou lead Thy servants! Scarcely are they out of one trial when again Thou stirrest up for them another.—Ver. 9. Schlier: God the Lord allows the evil spirit no power over us, if we have not first called down punishment upon ourselves by our sins; he who is in the power of darkness and therefore does the works of darkness, has before given himself up to darkness.—Ver. 10. Berlenb. Bible: Temptation with men who are grudging and envious and cannot bear the righteousness of the child of God, does not last long, because such men condemn their unrighteousness.—Ver. 11. Krummacher: The Lord in every way takes care that His servant David, adorned with His laurels, shall not lift his head too high. In David, too, is richly verified the apostolical saying: Whom the Lord loveth He

chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.—Vers. 13, 14. CRAMER: In cases of urgent need, where there is no time for long reflection, a woman can often more quickly devise a plan, surpassing therein the male sex (Eccl. xxv. 19; Gen. xxxi. 35; Josh. ii. 6). [HALL: Who can but wonder to see how . . . Saul's own children are the only means to cross him in the sin, and to preserve his guiltless adversary.—TR.].—Ver. 17. SCHLIER: A "lie of necessity" is never permissible, wrong can never become right; lying always remains wrong, and doubly wrong when the lie is spoken to a father. Truth is well-pleasing to God the Lord, and truth, spoken with an eye to the Lord, always finds the Lord's protection.—CRAMER: There are three sorts of lies: lies of necessity (Exod. i. 19; Gen. xx. 2; xxvi. 7; Josh. ii. 6); lies of sport (Gen. xlii. 9; xxvii. 15; Jud. ix. 8); shameful and hurtful lies. Guard against all three, and speak and love the truth from thy heart.—[TAYLOR: Michal's affection for David could not stand the strain of trial. It was not like that of Jonathan, because it had not, like Jonathan's its root in devotion to the Lord. She could not and did not follow her husband through persecution, and exile, and danger, because she was not one with him in God. (An idolater perhaps without the cognizance of her husband). She could tell lies for David, but she had not the courage and the faith to go with him into suffering, or to tell the truth for him.—TR.]

Ver. 18. OSIANDER: Those who are in trouble should betake themselves to the assembly where God's word is taught, and there seek consolation.—CRAMER: God always raises up for His people good friends and patrons, who must help them (1 Kings xviii. 13).—SCHLIER: Instead of any further answer, Samuel led David to his Naioth, into his school of the prophets; amid the songs of praise of his prophet-scholars, amid their common prayers and studies of God's word it was good to dwell; there was consolation and peace, there was help to be found even for such a troubled heart as David had. Let not such an example be presented you in vain. Are you troubled, then seek the word of the Lord and prayer, seek it especially there where men are gathered to attend to God's word and to pray. [HALL: God intended to make David not a warrior and a king only, but a prophet too. As the field fitted him for the first, and the court for the second, so Naioth shall fit him for the third.—TR.].—Ver. 20 sqq. STARKE [from HALL]: It is good going up to Naioth, into the holy assemblies; who knows how we may be changed, beside our intention? Many a one hath come into God's house to carp, or scoff, or sleep, or gaze, that hath returned a convert (1 Cor. xiv. 24, 25).—As one coal kindles another, so it happens that where good is taught and heard, hearts also do not remain unmoved (Acts xvi. 13, 14).—BERL. BIBLE: That is the blessing which God often grants to devout assemblies, that many a one goes in with an evil, impure and hostile mind, and comes out again with quite another heart and mind.—Vers. 23, 24. WUERT. SUMM.: Saul's prophesying was more an irresistible work of divine power, than an evidence of divine grace. We see also by his example, that not all who prophesy, who exhibit extraordinary movements of spirit, are thereby shown to have the Spirit of God, and to stand in favor with Him. Many of them, according to the saying of Jesus (Matt. vii. 22, 23), will on that day be found out and condemned as evil-doers.—SCHLIER: In Saul we have an example how God follows a man till he either turns or hardens himself. How deep was Saul already sunken; yet God the Lord did not yet leave him, but again turned toward him. He felt the mighty hand of God, and yet he would not bow. Then God's hand, which could not make him bow, must harden him more and more.—When the Lord's hand comes upon us, we wish to bow, we wish to enter into ourselves, and to humble ourselves. Well for him who lets himself be reproved and chastised, but woe to us if we shut ourselves up against the Lord's hand.—[TAYLOR: In reviewing this narrative, observe how diversified are the resources which Jehovah has at command for the protection of His people. Each time the means by which David was delivered are different. At first he is defended by God's blessing on his own valor against the Philistines; then he is indebted for his safety to the mediation of Jonathan; then to the agency of Michal; and finally to the miraculous work of God's own Holy Spirit. In the subsequent portion of the history we shall find that the same principle holds, and that in each new peril he is preserved by some new instrumentality.—TR.]

Vers. 11, 12. F. W. KRUMMACHER: *A new storm:* 1) By what David is threatened; 2) How he is delivered from the danger.—Ver. 18. *David at Ramah:* 1) He breathes the atmosphere of the communion of the saints; 2) He sees a new plan to murder him wonderfully frustrated.

[Vers. 4–7. *An attempt at Peacemaking:* 1) The means employed. Jonathan appeals, with tact and delicacy, to justice, gratitude, piety, memories of the past, conscience. 2) The apparent effect. Saul's better feelings revived, his conscience aroused. In his passionate way, he takes a solemn oath, no doubt with superficial sincerity. All seems restored "as in times past." 3) The final result. David's merits, at the call of Providence, shine forth with new lustre. Slumbering envy wakes, and the last enmity is worse than the first. (Comp. xx. 33, 34). Lessons: (1) It is at any rate a consolation to have *tried*, and to have had even temporary success. (2) Peacemaking does not always fail. (3) We must fear for the results wherever the wrong-doer does not repent of the *sin* involved; the only sure peacemaking must begin in peace with God. (4) How deep-rooted and ruinous a sin is envy; it may swallow up the noblest feelings, break the most solemn promises, lead to madness and murder. And no wonder, for the envious man sins at once against himself, his neighbor, and his God.—TR.]

II. *Jonathan's faithful friendship proved by his last vain attempt at a reconciliation of Saul and David.* Chapter XX. 1—XXI. 1 [Eng. A. V., XX. 42].

1. Conference between David and Jonathan as to the discovery of Saul's disposition towards the former and the mode of informing him thereof.

Chapter XX. 1-23.

1 And David fled from Naioth in Ramah, and came and said before Jonathan,[1]
What have I done? what is my iniquity and what is my sin before thy father that
2 he seeketh my life? And he said unto him, God forbid [Far be it[2]]! Thou shalt
not die; behold, my father will do[3] nothing either great or small but that he will
3 show it me, and why should my father hide this thing from me? it is not so. And
David sware[4] moreover,[5] and said, Thy father certainly knoweth [knoweth well][6]
that I have found grace in thine eyes, and he saith, Let not Jonathan know this,[7]
lest he be grieved. But truly, as the Lord [Jehovah] liveth, and as thy soul
4 liveth, there is but a step between me and death.[8] Then said Jonathan [And Jo-
nathan said] unto David, Whatsoever thy soul desireth [saith],[9] I will even [*om.*
5 even] do it for thee. And David said unto Jonathan, Behold, to-morrow is the
new moon, and I should not fail to sit[10] with the king at meat; but let me go, that
6 I may hide myself in the field unto the third[11] day at even. If thy father at all
[decidedly][12] miss me, then say, David earnestly asked[13] leave of me that he might
run to Bethlehem, his city, for there is a yearly sacrifice[14] there for all the family.
7 If he say thus, It is well, [*ins.* then] thy servant shall have peace; but if he be
8 very wroth,[15] *then* be sure that evil is determined by him. Therefore [And] thou
shalt deal kindly with[16] thy servant, for thou hast brought thy servant into a cove-
nant of the Lord [Jehovah] with thee; notwithstanding [but], if there be in me
iniquity, slay me thyself, for why shouldest thou bring me to thy father? And Jo-
9 nathan said, Far be it[17] from thee; for, if I knew certainly that evil were deter-
10 mined by my father to come upon thee, then would I not tell it thee?[18] Then said
David [And David said] to Jonathan, Who shall tell me? or what *if* thy father

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

1 [Ver. 1. Sept. "came before Jonathan and said," not so well. Wellhausen refers for a similar order to 2 Sam. xviii. 18.—Tr.]

2 [Ver. 2. The divine name is not in the Heb.—Tr.]

3 [Ver. 2. On the Qeri and Keth. see Exposition.—Tr.]

4 [Ver. 3. So Chald., Syr., Vulg., Arab.; Sept. "answered." Wellh.: "The Sept. is right for David never swears," but see latter part of this verse and 1 Kings ii. 8.—Tr.]

5 [Ver. 3. See Erdmann's Expos. against Thenius.—Tr.]

6 [Ver. 3. The Inf. Absol. is throughout the chapter variously translated.—Tr.]

7 [Ver. 3. Anonymous Greek version adds: "lest he tell David," which is probably a gloss and not a translation.—Tr.]

8 [Ver. 3. The Sept. here gives substantially the sense of the Heb.—Tr.]

9 [Ver. 4. Margin of Eng. A. V.: "Say what is thy mind," which is a free rendering.—Tr.]

10 [Ver. 5. Literally: "I should certainly sit," and so Chald. and Vulg., Syr., Arab., Rashi ("I am accustomed to sit") and the Greek vss. except Sept., which has "I will not sit," clearly from the succeeding narrative; on a special occasion like this (there seems to have occurred between ch. xix. and ch. xx. a reconciliation of Saul and David) he would be looked for.—Tr.]

11 [Ver. 5. The fem. form is difficult. We may suppose עֶרֶב here fem., or render (Rashi) "evening of the third day," against which is the Art. with עֶרֶב, or (with Sept. and Wellh.) omit the numeral.—Tr.]

12 [Ver. 6. Infin. Absol. "pressingly inquire after me."—Tr.]

13 [Ver. 6. Niph. reflexive.—Tr.]

14 [Ver. 6. Margin of Eng. A. V. "feast," which gives the sense.—Tr.]

15 [Ver. 7. Sept., "if he answer thee roughly," probably from ver. 10.—Tr.]

16 [Ver. 8. Heb. עַל. Sept., Chald., Syr. (perh. Vulg., Arab.) עִם which is the Heb. usage (עַל seems to be found nowhere else, לְ. אֶל. לִפְנֵי in a few instances after חֶסֶד).—Tr.]

17 [Ver. 9. This is the same Heb. phrase as is found in ver. 2.—Tr.]

18 [Ver. 9. Or, we may render: "If I knew, *etc.*, and did not tell thee —" and supply "Jehovah do so," *etc.* Syr.: "If I knew, *etc.*, I would come and tell thee," an impossible rendering, but perhaps from a different text.—Sept. adds after "come upon thee," μὴ ἢ εἰς τὰς πόλεις σου, which is probably a duplet (so Wellh.).—Tr.]

answer thee roughly?[19] And Jonathan said unto David, Come and let us go out
11 into the field. And they went out both of them into the field.
12 And Jonathan said unto David, O [By][20] Lord [Jehovah], God of Israel,
when I have sounded my father about to-morrow any time [this time to-morrow]
or the third day,[21] and behold, if there be good towards David, and I then send not
13 unto thee and shew it thee, the Lord [Jehovah] do so and much more to Jona-
[13] than.[22] *But* if it please my father to do thee evil, then I will shew it thee, and
send thee away that thou mayest go in peace, and the Lord [Jehovah] be with thee
14 as he hath been with my father. And thou shalt not only [And O that thou
wouldest][23] while yet I live show me the kindness of the Lord [Jehovah] that I
15 die not [And O,[23] if I die]. But *also* thou shalt [that thou wouldst] not cut off
thy kindness from my house forever, no, not [*ins.* even] when the Lord [Jehovah]
16 hath cut off the enemies of David every one from the face of the earth. So [And]
Jonathan made a *covenant* with the house of David, *saying,*[24] Let the Lord
even require [David, and Jehovah required] it at the hand of David's enemies.
17 And Jonathan caused David to swear[25] again, because he loved him, for he loved
him as he loved his own soul.
18 Then [And] Jonathan said to David [him], To-morrow is the new moon, and
19 thou shalt [wilt] be missed, because thy seat will be empty. And when thou hast
stayed three days, *then* [*om.* then] thou shalt go down quickly[26] and come to the
place where thou didst hide thyself when the business was in hand, and thou shalt
20 remain by the stone Ezel.[27] And I will shoot three arrows on the side thereof, as
21 though I shot at a mark.[28] And, behold, I will send a lad, *saying,* Go, find out
[*om.* out] the arrows. If I expressly say unto the lad, Behold, the arrows are on
this side of thee, take them, then come thou, for there is peace to thee and no hurt,
22 as the Lord [Jehovah] liveth. But if I say thus unto the young man, Behold the
arrows are beyond thee, [*ins.* then] go thy way, for the Lord [Jehovah] hath sent
23 thee away. And, as touching [as to] the matter which thou and I [I and thou]
have spoken of, behold the Lord [Jehovah] be between thee and me [me and thee]
forever.[29]

[19] [Ver. 10. See Erdmann in the Expos. No satisfactory rendering is offered by vss. or expositors. Eng. A. V. is substantially supported by Chald.; the other vss. render: "who will tell me whether thy father, *etc*?" and this seems best if the present text is retained. But, while there is no good external authority for changing the text, the meaning "whether perchance" for אוֹ מָה is not established.—Abarbanel quotes the explanation: "who will tell me if thy father answers peace, or who will tell me what thy father answers rough?" (which is nearly the form adopted by Erdmann), and then gives his own view that David says two things: 1) he asks who will tell him Saul's decision, whether good or bad? 2) he exclaims "or what will thy father, *etc*?"—Ewald and others follow the vss. as above.—Tr.]

[20] [Ver. 12. On the whole passage, vers. 12–17, see Erdmann's discussion.—The Vocative here (as in Eng A. V.) is hardly possible. The vss. supply different words, Syr., Arab., "witness," Sept., "knows." Two MSS. insert חַי "by the life of Jehovah" and Rashi calls it an oath. We must either so take it (which is simpler), or suppose the phrase interrupted and resumed below in the beginning of ver. 13.—Tr.]

[21] [Ver. 12. The same difficulty as in ver. 5; יוֹם occurs a few times (perhaps only in Ezek. vii. 10) as fem. We have also to supply "or" between מחר and השׁלשׁית. Yet we cannot throw out the latter (Wellh.) which is sustained by all the vss., and does not in its content contradict the narrative. Jonathan may easily have seen reason for putting off his inquiry till the third day.—Tr.]

[22] [Ver. 12. This clause clearly belongs to ver. 13.—Tr.]

[23] [Vers. 14, 15. Instead of לֹא read לֹא — לוּ, לוּא.—Tr.]

[24] [Ver. 16. There is no reason for the insertion of "saying" here. Chald., Vulg., render by the Aor. "required," Syr. has Fut. It is properly a remark of the author, not of Jonathan, but it sounds like a marginal gloss which has crept into the text, though the Sept. had it before them. See the Exposition. On the opinion that "David's enemies" here stands for "David" himself, and that this was fulfilled when his kingdom was divided because he deprived Mephibosheth of half of his possessions (2 Sam. xix.), see Poole's Synopsis *in loco*.—Tr.]

[25] [Ver. 17. Sept., "swore to David." The difficulty is in the reason assigned, namely, Jonathan's love for David, which seems to support the Greek reading, on which see Erdmann *in loco*.—Tr.]

[26] [Ver. 19. Literally "very." Sept. and apparently Chald (תִּתְבְּעֵי) and Syr. read פקד instead of ירד. The מְאֹד seems to be maintained by the vss., Chald. and Syr., "well, greatly," Vulg. "quickly" (so Eng. A. V.); some explain it of a deep descent into the valley. The Denom. שִׁלַּשְׁתָּ "thou shalt thrice do" (So Erdmann), hardly "thou shalt wait three days" (but contra Philippson, Wellh., and apparently some vss.). Perhaps the best rendering would be: "and the third day thou shalt watch thy opportunity and come to the place."—Tr.]

[27] [Ver. 19. Syr., "that stone," Chald., "stone of a sign," whence Rashi "*lapis viatorius*" to point travellers on the way.—Tr.]

[28] [Ver. 20. Literally "to shoot (me) at a mark." Sept. "I will shoot three times with arrows," afterwards one arrow only is mentioned, as in ver. 21, where the Heb. has the plu. And in ver. 36 we have the Sing. in the Heb. Yet this does not establish the Sept. reading, since the Plu. in the Heb. may be used in a general sense, while the Greek may have changed the number to make it agree with ver. 36.—Tr.]

[29] [Ver. 23. Chald. and Sept. have "a witness for ever," which may be simply an explanation, or they may have read עֵד for עַד.—Tr.]

2. Jonathan learns Saul's disposition towards David, and gives information to the latter, who flees.

VERS. 24—XXI. 1 [XX. 42].

24 So [And] David hid himself in the field. And when the new moon was
25 come, the king sat him down to eat meat. And the king sat upon his seat as at
other times, *even* [*om.* even] upon a [the] seat by the wall, and Jonathan arose[30]
26 and Abner sat by Saul's side, and David's place was empty. Nevertheless [And]
Saul spake not any thing that day, for he thought, Something hath befallen him, he
27 is not clean, surely he is not clean.[31] And it came to pass on the morrow, *which*
was the second *day* of the month [the morrow of the new moon, the second *day*],[32]
that David's place was empty; and Saul said unto Jonathan his son, Wherefore
28 cometh not the son of Jesse to meat, neither yesterday nor to-day? And Jonathan
29 answered Saul, David earnestly asked leave of me *to go* to Bethlehem; And he
said, Let me go, I pray thee, for our family hath a sacrifice in the city, and my
brother, he[33] hath commanded me *to be there;* and now, if I have found favor in
thine eyes, let me get away,[34] I pray thee, and see my brother. Therefore he cometh
not unto the king's table.
30 Then Saul's anger was kindled against Jonathan, and he said unto him, Thou
son of the perverse rebellious *woman*,[35] do I not know that thou hast chosen[36] the
son of Jesse to thy own confusion [shame] and unto the confusion [shame] of thy
31 mother's nakedness? For as long as the son of Jesse liveth upon the ground, thou
shalt not be established, nor thy kingdom. Wherefore [And] now, send and fetch
32 him unto me, for he shall surely die. And Jonathan answered Saul his father and
33 said unto him, Wherefore shall he be slain? what hath he done? And Saul cast[37]
a [his] javelin at him to smite him, whereby [and] Jonathan knew that it was de-
34 termined[38] of his father to slay David. So [And] Jonathan arose from the table
in fierce anger, and did eat no meat the second day of the month, for he was grieved
for David, because his father had done him shame.
35 And it came to pass in the morning that Jonathan went out into the field at the
36 time appointed with David, and a little lad with him. And he said unto his lad,
Run, find out [*om.* out] now the arrows which I shoot. *And* as [*om.* and as] the
37 lad ran [*ins.* and] he shot an [the] arrow beyond him. And when the lad was
come to the place of the arrow which Jonathan had shot, Jonathan cried after the
38 lad and said, Is not the arrow beyond thee? And Jonathan cried after the lad,
Make speed, haste, stay not. And Jonathan's lad gathered up the arrows[39] and
39 came[40] to his master. But [And] the lad knew not any thing; only Jonathan and
40 David knew the matter. And Jonathan gave his artillery[41] unto his lad, and said
41 unto him, Go, carry them to the city. As soon as the lad was gone [The lad went.]
[*ins.* And] David arose out of *a place* toward the south [arose from beside the
stone],[42] and fell on his face to the ground, and bowed himself three times; and they
kissed one another and wept with one another until David exceeded [wept greatly].[43]

30 [Ver. 25. On this reading see the Exposition.—Tr.]

31 [Ver. 26. Better, after the Sept., "he has not cleansed himself."—Tr.]

32 [Ver. 27. The Heb. is difficult. Wellh., combining Heb. and Sept., reads simply "on the second day." Chald.: "on the day after, which was the intercalation of the second month" (translated in Walton's Polyg. "the day after that day which was, *etc.*") that is the day after the "second new-moon," or the second day of the month. The rendering given above is altogether the easiest.—Tr.]

33 [Ver. 29. The Heb. does not admit this rendering. Wellh. suggests וְהִנֵּה "and lo!"—Tr.]

34 [Ver. 29. Some MSS. and edd. have "send me away."—Tr.]

35 [Ver. 30. Sept., son of "a faithless damsel," as if they read נַעֲרַת instead of נַעֲוַת, which is against the vss. and the rule *proclivi scriptioni præstat ardua.*—Tr.]

36 [Ver. 30. Sept., "art associated with" (חבר). The לְ before בֶּן is unusual. Yet if we substitute בְּ for לְ there seems to be no good reason for changing the text.—Tr.]

37 [Ver. 33. Or, brandished (*Bib.-Com.*).—Tr.]

38 [Ver. 33. Instead of כָּלָה הִיא read כָּלְתָה (Wellh.).—Tr.]

39 [Ver. 38. So in Qeri; the text has Sing. "arrow." See on ver. 20.—Tr.]

40 [Ver. 38. Sept., brought them," וַיָּבֵא. Between the two readings it is hard to decide.—Tr.]

41 [Ver. 40. Literally his "implements." The distinctive word "artillery," though now rarely used in this sense, is needed and should be retained.—Tr.]

42 [Ver. 41. A difficult passage. The Heb. (as given in Eng. A. V.) does not yield a good sense, and the vss. deal variously with the sentence. Chald.: "from beside the stone of the sign (or the stone Atha) which is on the

42 And Jonathan said to David, Go in peace, forasmuch as we have sworn both of us in the name of the Lord [Jehovah] saying, The Lord [Jehovah] be between me and thee and between my seed and thy seed forever.

CHAP. XXI. 1 And he arose and departed; and Jonathan went into the city.

south" (from ver. 19). Syr.: "from beside the stone," Sept., Vat., "from the Argab," Alex., "from sleep" (see *Orig. Hex. ed Montf.*), Vulg. and others as the Heb. It seems probable that the readings here and in ver. 19 are the same, and that we should render in both cases either "beside the stone" or "beside the stone Ezel (or, the sign-stone").—TR.]

[Ver. 42. Or, with Sept. and Wellh. omitting "David," "wept with one another greatly."—TR.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. Vers. 1–23. *Conversation and agreement between David and Jonathan on the mode of discovering Saul's real attitude toward David, and informing him of it.*

Ver. 1 is connected immediately with the foregoing, the narrative of *David's flight from Naioth in Ramah* standing in pragmatic connection with the account (close of ch. xix.) of the proceedings of Saul and his messengers. They came to seize David; instead of which the irresistible Spirit of God had overpowered them and defeated their design. David must herein have seen the protecting hand of his God, which thus gave him opportunity to flee from Naioth, where he could no longer find asylum.—Having by flight escaped the machinations of Saul and his followers, he seeks and finds a way to an *interview with Jonathan.*—*David's three-fold question* as to his fault is a *three-fold denial* of it, since it involves as many assertions of his innocence. An echo of this assertion is found in the declaration, so frequent in the Davidic Psalms, of his innocence and purity in respect to the persecutions of his enemies.—**That he seeks my soul**, that is, my life, comp. Ex. iv. 19. S. Schmid: "The questions in this verse are an appeal to Jonathan's own knowledge."—Ver. 2. *Jonathan's answer to David's complaint* is (1) the distinct *assurance:* **far be it, thou shalt not die,** and (2) the *ground* of this affirmation. Though this assurance has immediate reference to what David says of Saul's attack on him (as Jonathan's following words are intended to show that he knew nothing of such a murderous plan on Saul's part), yet at the same time Jonathan, looking to David's high divine mission for the people, prophetically declares what was determined in the Divine counsel concerning the maintenance and preservation of his friend's life.—For לוֹ ("to him") read לֹא ("not.") The marginal Impf. (יַעֲשֶׂה) is to be preferred to the Perf. of the text, expressing *customary* action ("does nothing" [Eng. A. V. "will do nothing"]); so Sept., Vulg., Chald. We may indeed read the word as Prtcp. with Bunsen, who therefore regards the "masoretic change" as unnecessary. Jonathan means to say: "My father as a rule does nothing without telling me, nothing great or small," that is, *absolutely nothing*, comp. xxii. 15, xxv. 36, Nu. xxii. 18. The appended remark: "Why should my father hide this thing from me? It is not so!" supposes that the intimate relation between Jonathan and David had been concealed as far as possible from Saul. They were secret friends, as far as he was concerned. Otherwise Saul would certainly not have spoken to his son Jonathan (xix. 1) of his purpose to kill David. This confirms what Jonathan here says to David. Saul's lack of self-control* showed itself in his taking counsel about his scheme of murder with those about him, his violent passion so mastering him that he could not at all conceal the fury of his heart. His communication of his plan (xix. 1) was the occasion of Jonathan's hindering it; Saul even swore to Jonathan that he would not kill David, and this Jonathan told David (xix. 6, 7). To this Jonathan's word here refers: "thou shalt not die," &c. Since that time there had been another war with the Philistines (*ib.* ver. 8), and shortly before this conversation of David and Jonathan the incident narrated in vers. 9–24 occurred. David's words in ver. 3: "he (Saul) thought Jonathan must not know this," confirm Jonathan's assurance that his father had told him nothing of a plan of murder. But, it may properly be asked, did Jonathan know nothing of the events just described, on which David's declaration is based? It is certainly possible that he [Jonathan] was at that time absent from court; but the connection does not favor this view. But, if he were present, Saul's attempt against David could not possibly have remained concealed from him. Accepting this supposition as the more probable, we must, in order to understand Jonathan's words, look at the whole situation. The account of all the occurrences from xix. 9 on exhibits Saul in a relatively unsound state of mind, produced by a new attack of rage and madness. As now Saul had before, after recovering from such an attack, sworn to Jonathan in consequence of his representations, that he would not kill David, Jonathan might regard this late attempt on David as the result of a new but temporary access of rage, and, remembering his distinct oath in his lucid period, might suppose that he would not in a quiet state of mind resolve on and execute such a murder. Thus his decided "it is not so" may be psychologically explained. Nägelsbach: "Between xix. 2 and xx. 2 there is no contradiction, since in the latter passage Jonathan merely denies that there is now a new attempt against David's life" (Herz. *R.-E.* xiii. 403). But while Jonathan had in mind merely the symptom in his father's condition, David knew how deeply rooted in envy and jealousy Saul's hate toward him was. He assures him with an oath, what was perfectly clear to him, that Saul sought his destruction. עוד refers to what is said in ver. 1, and so="*thereto, moreover,*" not "*the second time,*

*[This seems to be the meaning of Erdmann's *innere haltlosigkeit* here.—TR.]

again," since nothing is said of a previous oath. David's reply contains *two* things: (1) the *explanation* (connected with the indirect affirmation that Saul had resolved to murder him) of Jonathan's statement that Saul had said nothing to him of the murder, by referring to Saul's undoubted knowledge of the friendship between them, and (2) the *assertion* (with a double oath) that he saw nothing but death before him. (כִּי is here intensive, =*imo*, so especially in oaths, xiv. 44, 1 K. i. 29 sq., ii. 23 f., 2 K. iii. 14.—כְּ expresses comparison or similarity). "Yea, as a step, like a step." The picture is of a precipice, from which he is only a step removed, over which he may any moment be plunged.

Ver. 4. Jonathan's answer *supposes* that he gives credence to David's assertion, and proves his friendship by offering his help, with the declaration that he wished to fulfill every wish of his soul. The reply of David (ver. 5) shows how far he had cause to fear that there was only a step between him and death. The recollection of the obligation on him to take part in the *new moon* feast at court as a member of Saul's family (not merely as one (Then.) who had a standing formal invitation), brings him face to face with the danger in which his life stood; for the feast fell on the following day. On the *religious* celebration of the day of new moon with burnt-offering and sin-offering and sound of trumpet see Nu. x. 10, xxviii. 11–15. As a *joyful* festival it was connected with a *cheerful meal*. To this refers Saul's conjecture (ver. 26) that David was absent on account of levitical uncleanness. **And I must sit at table with the King.** That is, as a matter of course, according to custom, he would be expected by Saul to take part in the meal. The Vulg. rightly renders *ex more sedere soleo*, but the Sept., proceeding from the fact that David was not present, wrongly inserts a negative: "I shall not sit at meat." Ew. ҙ 338 b.: "*I am to sit,*" where the meaning is, "I will certainly sit." As in xvi. 2, it is here supposed that the custom was to *sit*, not to *recline* at table.—**Let me go, that I may hide myself.** This is not a mere formula of courtesy, but a request that Jonathan would not press him to appear at table, but permit him to depart, that he might escape the danger threatening him. **Till the evening of the third day**, that is, from the present day. This supposes that the festival was prolonged by a meal the day after new moon.—Comp. vers. 12, 27, 34, where Saul looks for David also the day after new moon.—From the fact that both David and Saul here look to the former's appearance at the royal table, it has been held (Then., Ew.) that this whole narrative contradicts ch. xix., and is taken from another source. But there is no contradiction if we remember that Saul acted (according to xix. 9 sq.) under an attack of rage or madness, and, on the return of a quiet frame of mind, would expect everything to go on as usual, and the whole *personnel* of his family to be present at table. After his previous experiences, David must now know certainly whether Saul in his times of quiet and lucidness, maintained against him that hostile disposition which showed itself in his intermittent attacks of rage.—Ver. 6. David wishes through Jonathan to determine Saul's attitude toward him, and find out certainly whether in his hate the latter has really conceived a plan for his destruction. As David, according to ver. 5, is to hide in the *field till* the evening of the third day, his excuse for absence can be regarded only as a pretext, or a "lie of necessity," and the explanation that, by reason of the proximity of Bethlehem to Gibeah, he might, meantime, easily go home, must be rejected as out of keeping with the sense of the whole narrative. In this statement, which Jonathan was to make in case Saul missed David, namely, that the latter had gone to attend a family feast, the fact (easily explained from the absence of a central sanctuary) is supposed "that individual families in Israel were accustomed to celebrate yearly festivals" (Keil); this would be the case more naturally in those places where, as in Bethlehem (comp. xvi. 2 sq.), there were altars dedicated to the Lord as centres of sacrifice. O. v. Gerlach: "In the then disorganized condition of public worship, to which David first gave regular form, family usages of this sort, after the manner of other nations, had established themselves, which were contrary to the prescriptions concerning the unity of divine worship." On the yearly sacrifice see on ch. i. 1.—(נִשְׁאֹל from the connection not Pass. but Reflex.,="sought for himself.") David could ask leave of absence from Jonathan as competent representative of the royal family, if he did not wish to go to Saul.—Ver. 7. Saul's conduct in these two contrasted forms, was for Jonathan as for David the sign of his permanent attitude towards David in the condition of quiet in which he now was; for such a sign was necessary not only for Jonathan (S. Schmid) but also for David, since, as appears from the tenor of the whole narration, he did not yet certainly know how Saul in the depths of his heart was disposed towards him. If he says "*well,*" it means peace for thy servant, that is, from the connection, "he has laid no plot of murder against me." In the other event, if his "*anger burn,*" know that *evil* on his part is a settled thing. כָּלְתָה="to be finished, settled," "*firmiter decretum est*" (S. Schmid). The "*evil*" is not "malice," and its development to the highest point (Vulg.), but the danger to David, Saul's murder scheme, as appears from the phrase "by him."—Ver. 8. **And show mercy to thy servant,**—this refers not merely to the request of ver. 6 (S. Schmid, Keil), nor to what Jonathan should do in case Saul's answer was unfavorable, but to the general help expected from him, that David might escape the threatened danger. That it includes what David looks for from Jonathan in case Saul answers angrily, appears from *Jonathan's reply* in ver. 9. David grounds his request on the *covenant of the Lord* which Jonathan had made with him. So he calls their covenant of friendship, because it was not only made with invocation of the Lord's name, but also had its deepest ground and origin in God, and its consecration in their life-like communion with God. **Thou hast brought me,**—this indicates the initiative which, in the concluding of the covenant, was on the side of Jonathan (xviii. 1–3).—In the words: "If there is iniquity in me, slay thou me," David adds a special request, which is

closely connected with what precedes. He would rather atone for any sin which might rest on him by death at his *friend's* hand; Jonathan shall do him the kindness in this case not to deliver him up to Saul, that he may not be slain by *him*. This supposes that Jonathan had the right to inflict capital punishment for crimes against his father as king.—Ver. 9. Jonathan's answer first decidedly sets aside the case last put by David. The "far be it from thee" is not to be connected with what follows, as if it were here said what was to be far (Ges., Del., Maur.), but is to be taken absolutely, and to be referred (as ver. 2) to what David had just said. The "from thee" is therefore not expletive (Cleric.) The Vulg. rightly: *absit hoc a te*. This involves Jonathan's firm conviction of David's innocence.—Then follows Jonathan's solemn assurance that he will inform David if Saul exhibits a hostile disposition towards him. This was the service of love which he had first to do for his friend, that the latter might then take further measures for saving his life. (כִּי is particle of asseveration=yea, truly.) **If I know certainly that * * * *** that is, if, from your statement (ver. 7), I know beyond doubt that evil on my father's part is a thing determined. From the connection, and on account of the vigor and emphasis of the interrogation, which is in keeping with Jonathan's excited feeling, it is better to construe the "if," *etc.*, as first member (protasis), and the "and not," &c., as second interrogative member (apodosis) of a conditional sentence* [as in Eng. A. V.]—Ver. 10, Tremell, Ges., Ew. (§ 352 *a*), Then. and Bunsen take this as one sentence: "who will show me what rough thing perchance thy father will answer thee" (אוֹ מָה=whatever thing); against which we must insist with Keil that this signification of אוֹ occurs only where another case is mentioned, where the ground-meaning is "*or*." As מָה ["what"] indicates a new question, we must here suppose *two questions*. The first: **Who will show me?** is connected immediately with the last words of Jonathan in ver. 9: "I will come to thee and tell thee," namely, the evil determined on by my father. David is thinking in this first question of the danger which Jonathan would thus incur, and, for that very reason, putting him out of the question, asks: "*Who* will show me (the evil)," that is, what thy father decrees against me (Maur.) "He asks what he would be willing to tell a servant" (S. Schmid). The *Berl. Bib.* explains excellently: "The matter cannot be entrusted to a servant, and thou must have care for thyself, lest thou also come under thy father's displeasure." The sense is therefore: "*No one* will tell me," namely, the evil determined by Saul. This question, with its negative sense, is the answer, spoken with excited feeling, to Jonathan's word: "I will tell thee the evil determined on," and the tender, thoughtful form in which he clothes the decided: "Thou canst not tell me." The *second question:* **Or what harsh thing will thy father answer thee?** refers to Saul's anger (ver. 7), whence Jonathan purposed learning that Saul's evil plan against David was completed. Schmid's explanation: "and if thou choose a messenger, how shall I understand what evil thy father answers?" rests on the false distinction between a person bringing the information (to whom only the first question is to refer), and the nature of the information (to which the second question is to refer), and requires us to supply a sentence which could by no means have been omitted. Maur., De Wette, Keil regard the question as referring to the evil *consequences* to Jonathan, if he himself brought the information to David: What would thy father answer thee hard (Maur.: "what thinkest thou he would decree against thee," contrary to to the meaning of עָנָה), if thou thyself didst it? Against this is the word "*answer*," since Jonathan would not say to Saul that he intended to tell David—and we cannot appropriately supply the idea that, if Saul afterwards heard of Jonathan's going to David, he would answer him harshly. Rather the second question reads fully: "Or who will tell what thy father," *etc.* Saul's evil word, by which his fixed evil purpose is to be discovered, is distinguished from this latter. But the evil answer is not to be understood of threats against David (Böttcher), but of harsh language towards Jonathan (vers. 6, 7). In this double question David denies or doubts that in this unfortunate case information can be given him. The two-fold question, with its negative meaning, corresponds to David's excited state of mind, and makes a full and candid conversation necessary, for which purpose Jonathan invites David to go with him to the field. [Erdmann's translation is hardly satisfactory; the second clause does not suit the question: "who will tell?" The rendering: "who will tell me if perchance thy father," &c., is the smoother, and suits the context better, but it is doubtful whether אוֹ can mean simply "if."—Tr.] Ver. 11. **Let us go into the field**, namely, out of the city of Gibeah, or the royal residence therein, where this conversation was held. It certainly accords with David's words to suppose that they wished to escape from observation (Then.), in order to speak further undisturbedly of the matter, and to think over ways and means (*Berl. Bib.*); but at the same time the context suggests as another aim, that Jonathan wished to point out what he thought a fit place wherein to give his friend by a trustworthy sign the desired information, comp. vers. 19–24. This obviously supposes Jonathan's fixed determination, in spite of David's protest, to bring the message himself. That Jonathan went out for the sake of the *oath* which he afterwards [see ver. 42] renewed with David (Grot.: "they used to swear in the open air") is less probable.

Vers. 12-23 is essentially the full positive answer to David's question, which was meant in a negative sense. Vers. 12, 13. Jonathan's solemn oath that he will inform him of the mind of his father. The solemnity and loftiness of the vow, heightened by the oath, answers to the epoch-making importance and decisive significance of this moment in David's life; for from this moment David's way must coincide with that of Saul, or for ever diverge from it and be for him a way of uninterrupted suffering.—That Jonathan begins his address with a solemn invocation of God, "Jehovah, God of Israel" (De Wette, Keil) [so

* [See "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

Eng. A. V., see "Text. and Gram."] is untenable, because there is no analogy for such a mode of address, and because of the introduction "Jonathan said to *David*" (Thenius). Nor can we suppose an interrupted discourse, resumed in ver. 13, for against this is the beginning of ver. 13: "The Lord do so."* As an oath follows, it is simplest to regard this as the formula of an oath by God, not supplying (with Maurer): "may God destroy me," or (Syr., Arab.): "God is my witness," but (with Thenius supplying חַי "after Cod. Kenn. 560 and 224 margin," which might easily fall out before יהוה) reading: "as God lives;" unless with Bunsen we take the "Jehovah, God of Israel," as a lively ejaculation in the sense of an oath="*by God*."—The *protasis* begins: "when I sound my father," and goes to the end of ver. 12. כָּעֵת מָחָר="to-morrow about this time," as in 1 Kings xix. 2; xx. 6; 2 Kings vii. 1, 18, and the full phrase in Josh. xi. 6 (Gesen.). The following word "on the third day" is without a conjunction (which with Sept. and Vulg. is to be supplied from the sense) and similarly depends on כָּעֵת,="the third day about this time." This expression "to-morrow or next day" refers to the statement of time in ver. 5, and supposes that the festival was continued by a meal the day after new moon. **And behold, there is good for David,** *etc.*—In circumstantial phrase, which befits the solemn and serious character of the situation, Jonathan distinguishes the two cases, the favorable and the unfavorable, in order to make each the object of a solemn oath. Jonathan swears that in the first case he will *send to David* to *uncover his ear*, that is, to reveal to him, inform him that Saul is favorably disposed towards him, comp. xxii. 8.—Ver. 13 the *apodosis:* "so do the Lord to Jonathan," *etc.* The same formula in oaths in xiv. 44; 1 Kings xix. 2.—The opposite case is introduced with כִּי without adversative particle: "(But) if it please my father to do thee evil," *etc.*†

The apodosis: "I will show it thee and send thee away that thou mayest go in peace," asserts, in distinction from the preceding apodosis, that Jonathan in this case will bring David the information himself without the intervention of a *messenger*. With this promise, confirmed by an oath, Jonathan connects the *wish:* "The Lord be with thee as he hath been with my father." This indicates that Jonathan has at least a presentiment of David's high destiny and his future calling, which he is some time to fulfil as King of Israel in Saul's place.—This comes out still more clearly in what follows. For in vers. 14–16 with such a presentiment he begs David in the future to maintain faithfully his mercy and love towards him even in misfortune. On the ground of what is now happening to Saul and David under the divine providence, he foresees how Saul and his house will be hurled from the royal power, and David thereto elevated. In Jonathan's pious soul, which felt and perceived God's righteous working, there lay hid a divinatory and prophetic element, as here appears. Jonathan, having before expressed his wish for David, here declares what he desires from David as counter-proof of faithful friendship. With reference to the oriental custom of killing the children and relations of the former king on ascending the throne, Jonathan begs David hereafter to show mercy to his house. "The syntactical construction is a somewhat violent one, as accords with the emotion of the speaker" (Bunsen). Of the various explanations of this difficult passage only the two following are worthy of consideration. The one understands a *question* to the end of ver. 14: "And wilt thou not, if I yet live, wilt thou not show me the kindness of the Lord, that I die not?" Ver. 15 cannot then be a part of the question, but must be taken as the subjoined expression of confident expectation: "And thou wilt not cut off thy kindness from my house for ever, not even when," *etc.* But this sudden, abrupt transition to a question and then again to direct discourse is strange, even if these vacillations and diversities of discourse are referred to Jonathan's excited feeling. The second explanation, which is the preferable one, introduces a wish by a slight change in the pointing of the Hebrew.* Jonathan, having invoked a blessing on David, thus expresses his wish for himself: "And wouldst thou, if I still live, wouldst thou show me the kindness of God, and not, if I die, not cut off thy love from my house for ever?" So Syr., Arab., Maur., Then., Ew., Keil. The correspondence and parallelism of the clauses is thus evident: to "if I yet live" answers "if I die."†

---

* [Yet it is quite possible to read: "Jehovah, God of Israel—when I have sounded, *etc.*,—if there be good and I show it not, so do Jehovah to Jonathan," which is instead of "Jehovah do so to me if there be good and I show it not." The difficulty is only in the post-position of the adjuration.—Tr.]

† Instead of Hiphil יֵיטִב read with Böttch. and Then. Qal. יִיטַב, "which may be construed, as with לְ לִפְנֵי בְּעֵינֵי (Ps. lxiv. 32), so also with אֶל" (Böttch.). The Accus. particle before the subject הָרָעָה—"as respects," quoad, "if it please my father in respect of evil." "But this word (אֵת) can never denote the Nominative; yet often only the general sense of the discourse calls forth the Acc., since the active form of connection everywhere presses in as the most natural" (Ew., § 277 *d*). So stands the Accus.-particle after the opposite of יִיטַב, that is, יֵרַע, 2 Sam. xi. 25. Bunsen remarks that after "my father" לְהָבִיא "to bring," has probably fallen out. But "it is not necessary, in order to maintain אֵת as Accus. particle, to insert a supposed לְהָבִיא from the Sept. What the latter renders *ἀνοίσω* is clearly not לְהָבִיא, but אָבִי itself read as אָבִיא (as in 1 Kings xxi. 29; comp. 1 Samuel xvii. 54; xviii. 27), because יִיטַב אֶל־ was wanting in its text" (Böttch.).

* In ver. 14, instead of the double וְלֹא is read וְלוּא, or וְלוּ—וְלֹא, particle of wish, so in xiv. 30; Isa. lxiii. 19: "O that," *utinam*, usually with the Impf., Ew. § 329 *b*, § 358 *b*.

† For אָמוּת, which, put thus absolutely, accords with the feeling of the speaker, we are not with Thenius after Sept. and Vulg. to read וְאִם מוֹת אָמוּת; the conditional particle is often wanting, and is here naturally supplied from the preceding "If I still live."

To the "show kindness to *me*" answers the similar negative request, "cut not off thy kindness from my *house*,—not even when," &c. "*Kindness of the Lord;*" that is, love, goodness, such as the Lord, as covenant-God, shows His people according to His promise, and, therefore, one member of the people ought to show to another, especially in such a covenant of love made in the presence of the Lord. By this request for the "kindness of the *Lord*" Jonathan indicates David's *duty* to show him this love. "Not even when the Lord shall cut off the enemies of David, every one from the face of the earth." The בְּהַכְרִית forms an assonance to וְלֹא תַכְרִית: "do not *cut off* . . . even when the Lord shall *cut off*." Jonathan clearly understands that enmity against David is enmity against the Lord's purpose and act, and that God's destroying judgment must fall on his father's house because of its opposition to the will of the Lord. His request that *his* house may be excepted from this judgment, as executor of which he regards David, is founded on and justified by his position outside of the circle of "enemies" (since he recognises God's will concerning David, and bends to it as David's *friend*), so that, though a member of Saul's house, he does not belong to it so far as concerns the judgment of extermination.—See the fulfilment of Jonathan's request, 2 Sam. ix.—Ver. 16 is a remark of the narrator 1) on this covenant between Jonathan and David, and 2) on the actual fulfilment of Jonathan's word respecting the overthrow of David's enemies. "And Jonathan made a covenant with the house of David." After יִכְרֹת supply בְּרִית: comp. xxii. 8; Josh. vi. 1; Judg. xix. 30; 2 Chr. vii. 18 [1 Kings viii. 9. The examples from Josh. and Judges present omissions of other words.—Tr.]—The second part of the verse (וּבִקֵּשׁ) is by many put into Jonathan's mouth as part of his oath, "and the Lord take vengeance on the enemies of David" (Then., Maur., De Wette, Buns.). But the objection to this is, that then (unless with Then. we adopt the corrupt Sept. and Vulg. text: "and may Jonathan's name not be cut off from the house of David") we must supply "saying" (אָמַר between ו and בִּקֵּשׁ), which is hard, and is not found elsewhere. And Keil rightly remarks that after the insertion between conjunction and verb the Perf. could not have an Optative sense. Finally against this view is the fact that it is psychologically and ethically not quite conceivable how Jonathan should have expressed such a *wish*, especially as this judgment as a future fact had already been distinctly looked at by him, and was the condition and basis of his wish. "Require at the hand" (בִּקֵּשׁ מִיַּד) = "take vengeance, punish," with the word "blood," 2 Sam. iv. 11, *without* it here and Josh. xxii. 23.—Ver. 17. **And Jonathan caused David to swear again.** According to the connection this does not refer to what follows from ver. 18 on (Maur.), but concludes naturally the transaction between Jonathan and David,—but not as an oath by which Jonathan assures *David* anew that he will keep his promise (Then.), according to the incorrect rendering of Sept. and Vulg. "he swore *to David*" (from which Then. would read "*to* David," instead of Acc. "David")—rather it is an oath by which Jonathan adjures David to fulfil his last request (vers. 14, 15). The "again" refers to ver. 12. He adjured him "by his love to him;" that is, he made his love to David the ground of his request, so that David might in turn show his love. [Or, his love to David made him anxious to maintain friendly relations between their houses; he could not bear to think of his children shut out from the love of this his much-loved friend, whom he loved as himself.—Tr.]. The words: "for he loved him as his own soul" confirm and define the preceding "by his love to him," and indicate the cordialness of his friendly love, which is like his love for himself; that is, he loves his friend as himself. The "soul" is the centre of the inner life and of the whole personality. Comp. xviii. 1–3.

Ver. 18 sq. Further conversation on the carrying out of Jonathan's promise.—As to ver. 18 comp. ver. 5.—(The Perf. with Waw consec. has a future signification when preceded not only by an express Fut. but also by any indication of futurity, as here the words: "to-morrow is new moon.") The presupposed situation is resumed as basis for the following agreement.—Ver. 19. **And on the third day come down quickly.** If we point the Heb. form as a verb = "to do a thing the third day" (וְשִׁלַּשְׁתָּ), Ges., Ew., Maur., it is to be taken asyndetically with the following word in an adverbial sense (Ges., § 142, 3, c) = "do it on the third day that thou come down." But this sense of the word occurs nowhere else; Gesenius' reference to the Arab. "to come every fourth day" does not suit here, because nothing is said of coming *every* fourth day. We might more easily assume the meaning "to do a thing the third time" (1 Kings xviii. 34), and render "a third time come down." The first time of his going down was in xix. 2, our present narrative gives the second time, and ver. 35 would be the third time. But besides the forced character of this explanation, we have against this vocalization of the Heb. text (the Sept. τρισσεύσεις favors it) the Chald., Syr., Arab., and Vulg., which render "*And on the third day,*" and we must therefore read וּשְׁלִשִׁית, which agrees with ver. 5. The words "*Come down very*" [so literally the Heb.] are also somewhat strange; not on account of the Adv. "down" (Then.), for this is explained by the nature of the ground, the field of meeting being lower than the surrounding highlands (*Cler.:* "Jonathan seems to wish David to go down into a very deep valley as near as possible to Gibeah, where Jonathan himself would tell him what was to be done" —but on account of the word "very" (מְאֹד). The Vulg. has "descend *quickly*." From the difficulty of the reading some substitute "thou wilt be missed" (תִּפָּקֵד, Chald., Syr., Ar.) for the "come down;" but, apart from the difficulty of explaining how the Heb. text came from this reading, the expression "On the third day thou wilt be much missed" is very strange, and the "very" with "come down" is less surprising if we take it = "quickly," and suppose it necessary to insist on a quick descent to the place of meeting on account of the danger of being observed. Perhaps, however, the text is

corrupt, and instead of מְאֹד ("very") we should read מֹעֵד, "appointed place of meeting," comp. Josh. viii. 14. It would be an Acc. of place as in ver. 11; see the similar expression in verse 35, which refers to this passage. [Eng. A. V. gives a very doubtful translation of the Heb. text; see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.].—**And come to the place where thou didst hide on the day of the business.** These words are usually rightly referred to the narrative in xix. 2. But what does "the day of the business" mean? Against the reference to the *wicked deed* of Saul, which forced David to fly (Maur., Ew., De Wette), Thenius rightly says that the word never means "wicked deed" in itself, but only when the connection points to it (Job xxxiii. 17). But in xix. 2. there is mention not of a deed, but only of a *purpose* of Saul; the explanation "on the day of the purposed evil" (Ew.) adds something not contained in the word. Against the rendering "on the *work day*" as opposed to "feast-day" (Chald., Sept., Vulg., Ges., Luther) is the fact that, as Then. remarks, to obtain a fitting sense, we must then read: "Thou wilt come *from* the place where thou (on the work-day) shalt have hidden thyself." Bunsen's explanation "on the day when that happened" (xix. 2, 3) attenuates the meaning of the Heb. word (מַעֲשֶׂה), yea, directly contradicts it. [The word means "something done."—Tr.] The rendering "on the day of the business (known to thee)" (Tanchum, Then., Keil) is unsatisfactory, because it is then wholly uncertain what business occurred on that day. Holding fast to the view that that day (xix. 2 sq.) was the one here referred to, the "business," regarded by Jonathan as specially memorable, could only be Jonathan's deed, when near that spot he turned aside his father's murderous thoughts from David, having brought him to the spot where David was hidden and could hear the conversation. This was the business which Jonathan's brief allusion would suggest to David. A reference to this explanation is found as early as Clericus: "rather the allusion seems to be to the day when Jonathan occupied himself with this very business of David's safety."—**And remain by the stone Ezel.** (Sept. παρὰ τὸ Εργὰβ ἐκεῖνο, הָאַרְגָּב הַלָּז, "by that stone-heap." So Then. and Ew., except that the latter reads הָאֵזֶל, "the lonely waste." There is, however, no need for change of text; אֶבֶן is a hollow rock as a hiding-place, and Ezel is a proper name.) [On the reading see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.].—Ver. 20. *He will shoot three arrows on the side of the stone;* the Art. "*the* three arrows" is explained by supposing that Jonathan, who had no doubt come armed, showed David three arrows by which the latter might from his hiding-place recognise his presence. Jonathan would act as if he were practicing at a mark (Vulg. "as if exercising at a mark"), it being understood that the arrows thus shot were to be gathered up* from the place where they fell, whether in front of or behind the mark. (Böttcher: In צִדָּה the Raphe, as the accent shows, denotes that ה loses its aspiration by reason of the neighboring hard consonants (2 צ and then ד), or remains as suffix הּ ָ, not as toneless local ה ָ; this ה ָ refers to the preceding fem. אֶבֶן, so that צִדָּה = *juxta eam, at its* (*the stone's*) *side* (so render Vulg., De Wette, and even Luther), expresses a definite mark.)—Ver. 21. *The agreement as to the sign*, whereby David was to know whether there was danger for him or not. Before "go, find the arrows" the word "saying" has not fallen out, but is to be supplied (with Sept. and Vulg.) from the sense. Comp. xi. 7; Isa. x. 3, 4. The procedure is as follows: The servant, taking position by order on the side of the mark, is first, after the shooting, to go to the mark in order to find the arrows; if then Jonathan calls to him: "The arrows are from thee," that is from the place where thou art "*hitherward*," bring them,—that is a sign for David that it is well, he is to come; **for there is peace to thee, and it is nothing, as the Lord liveth.** But if (ver. 22) he says: "The arrows are from thee," that is "*yonsides*," that is a sign that David is to go away, to flee. **For the Lord sendeth thee away**, that is, commands thee to go away.—Ver. 23. **And the word that we have spoken**, that is, not merely the sign agreed on, but (as is indicated by the "we" and the "I and thou") what they had said *to one another* in the whole affair, and promised one another before the Lord. **Behold, the Lord is between me and thee for ever,** comp. Gen. xxxi. 49. We need not with Sept. supply the word "witness," since without it the thought is clearly expressed that it is the Lord in whom they have here anew concluded their covenant of friendship, and in whose fear they feel themselves bound to maintain it and fulfil their promises to one another.

Vers. 24–34. *The execution of the agreement, and the open exhibition of Saul's deadly hate against David.*—Ver. 24. Instead of "sat," the Sept. has "came to the table," but the Heb. text is to be retained as in keeping with the rapid and minute portraiture of the narrative. The text "*on*" (above) the food [עַל, Eng. A.V. omits the prep.] is to be retained against the marginal reading (Qeri) "to;" "he who sits at table is *elevated*, comp. Prov. xxiii. 30" (Maur.).—"*David* hid himself—*Saul* sat at table on new-moon-day,"—this lapidary double remark admirably and vividly introduces the following narration, which is marked precisely by this two-fold fact. Saul sat in his "*seat by the wall*," as the highest, most honorable place, opposite the door. See Harmar, *Beob. über d. Orient*, II. 66 sq. "As time on time," that is, as formerly, as usually, comp. iii. 4; Num. xxiv. 1. Vulg. *secundum consuetudinem*. The word "*arose*" presents serious difficulties. It is proposed to adopt the Sept. καὶ προεφθασε τὸν Ἰωνάθαν (וַיְקַדֵּם for וַיָּקָם), and render "Jonathan sat in front" (Then., Ew., Buns.). But this meaning of the Heb. word is not proved, while the rendering of the Sept. "he (Saul) went before Jonathan" would certainly accord with it, since the verb means "to go before." But that would be understood of itself, apart from the fact that the context and the syntax do not allow us to take "Saul" as subject; therefore, too, Clericus'

* [This Verb is supplied conjecturally, being omitted in the German text.—Tr.]

explanation falls to the ground; "Saul alone preceded Jonathan," that is, Jonathan sat down next after him. The rendering of the Sept. clearly springs from the difficulty of the expression "And Jonathan arose." We must try to hold to the text. The Syr. renders: "And Jonathan arose and seated himself and Abner (seated himself) at Saul's side" (connecting וַיֵּשֶׁב with וַיָּקָם and putting ו before אַבְנֵר). But the insertion of "and" is arbitrary, the "sat" must be connected with "Abner," and the circumstantial introduction of the simple matter-of-course act "sat" by the phrase "arose," which always emphatically indicates a transition from rest to a new act or activity, is somewhat farcical. The explanation "and Jonathan came" (De Wette, Maurer: Jonathan sat down next after Saul) does not agree with the meaning of the Heb. word (קום), which is used instead of "coming" in the elevated, solemn sense = "appearing," but never of simple "coming." If we keep the text and render "and Jonathan arose, and Abner sat" (Vulg.), the only possible explanation is: Jonathan rose from his place *when Abner came*, whether to show him honor as his uncle, or to give him his proper place at Saul's side, which he had taken perhaps in Abner's absence under the impression that the latter would not come to the meal.—Another rendering, however, naturally suggests itself; pointing the verb (ישׁב) as causative (Hiph. וַיֹּשֶׁב, written defectively) as in 2 Chr. x. 2 (Ges. § 69, 3 R. 7), and understanding that Jonathan had already seated himself after Saul, and that David's absence was observed, we translate "he arose, and seated Abner at Saul's side," that is, in the place left vacant by David's absence,* in order that the seat next to Saul might not be empty, he himself having taken the seat on the other side of Saul.—Maurer conjectures that the words "and Jonathan arose" have been inserted here by the mistake of a transcriber from the beginning of ver. 34.—Ver. 26. The first day Saul explained David's absence by supposing that he was ceremonially unclean and unable to take part in the religious festival. See Lev. vii. 20 sq.; xv. 16; Deut. xxiii. 4. [Kitto suggests as the explanation of Saul's expecting David, that he supposed David would infer from the occurrence at Naioth xix. 24, that Saul's mood was changed, and there was no longer danger.—Tr.].—Ver. 27. The statement of time here is with Keil to be literally rendered: "it was on the morrow after the new moon, the second day (הַשֵּׁנִי is Nom. with וַיְהִי, not Gen. after הַחֹדֶשׁ) and David's place was missed," so De Wette: "it came to pass on the following day of the new moon, the second." In reply to Saul's question about him Jonathan gave the answer agreed on in ver. 6, only adding that David was called to Bethlehem by his brother.—Ver. 28. **David earnestly asked leave of me to Bethlehem**, an elliptical expression, in which "to go" (ver. 6) is to be supplied.—Ver. 29. **And he hath commanded me, my brother, and now**, *etc.* Stumbling at the Sing. "*brother*," the Sept. has "*brothers*;" we are to understand the eldest brother (Ew.) as head of the family, who had the care of the domestic arrangements for the feast. Vulg. wrongly: "one of my brothers." Syr. and Arab. wrongly translate: "and he (David) exhorted me and said to me, my brother, if, *etc.*" Jonathan's quotation of David's words is somewhat loose and incompact, agreeing with the cordial, light tone in which one friend makes such statements to another in confidential intercourse. This is the explanation also of the somewhat rough and jocose phrase "let me get away, take myself off" (אִמָּלְטָה). Comp. the "run" in ver. 6 (Bunsen).

Ver. 30 sq. Saul's outbreak of wrath in consequence of these words of Jonathan. Against the rendering "*thou son of a woman perverse and rebellious*" (literally, "perverse one of rebellion," נַעֲוַת as Ni. partcp., Maurer: "son of a perverse and contumacious mother—O perverse and obstinate son") is partly the hardness of the phrase "perverse one of rebellion," partly the monstrosity of the insult thus offered to Jonathan's mother, which contradicts the Heb. family-spirit.* The last objection lies also against the rendering of Sept. and Vulg. "thou son of a rebellious woman" (נַעֲרָה for נַעֲוַת, Then.), or, as Vulg., "thou son of a woman who voluntarily seizes on a man" (obviously reading הַמִּרְדָּף (Isa. xiv. 6) or הַפִּרְדּוֹף for מַרְדּוּת). So Ew., who puts Plu. instead of Sing.: "thou son of wenches who run after (men)." The most tolerable rendering is that of Köster, unjustly made light of by Then., found also in Clericus: "Thou son of perversity of rebellion" (taking נַעֲוַת as abstract noun, Ni. particip. of עוה), full of perverse rebellion. Cleric.: "It is much better to say that Jonathan is called a son of perversity of rebellion, a common Hebraism for a man of perverse and refractory nature."† Saul observes that Jonathan is on the side of David, whom he wishes to destroy as an aspirant after the throne and therefore a rebel. And so he looks on Jonathan also as a rebel.—In the words "*Do I not know?*" Saul intimates that he is well aware of the secret friendship between Jonathan and David, and regards this excuse as confirmatory of his opinion. (בָּחַר denotes choice out of love, commonly construed with בְּ, here only with לְ. [On the unnecessary Sept. reading see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]). **To thy shame and to the shame of thy mother's nakedness**, who will be ashamed of having borne thee. So we must translate, and not with De Wette, "to the shame and nakedness of thy mother," nor with Bunsen, "to the shame of thy unchaste mother." Such an expression from Saul would be in con-

* [Similar is Abarbanel's view, and also Rashi's.—Tr.]

* [The most grievous insult to an Arab is one directed against his mother, but such a phrase is not probable here; in the general uncertainty and obscurity of the language, Erdmann's explanation seems the least objectionable.—Tr.]

† [Wellhausen reads after Sept. נַעֲרַת ה׳ and renders from Judg. xvi. 12 (παῖδας αὐτομολούντων, comp. Lagarde's Syr. vs.) "runaway slave." On our passage Frankel (*Vorstudien zur* LXX. 187) says: "The Hagada relates that Jonathan's mother was one of the maidens carried off at Shiloh (Judg. xxi.), and willingly offered herself to Saul (comp. Rashi *in loco*). This Hagada is expressed in the Greek (LXX.), and still more clearly in the Vulgate. So also in *Joseph. Ant.* VI. 11, 9, probably from the Sept., as is frequent with Josephus."—Tr.]

tradiction to his previous reference to Jonathan's mother according to the translation which we have rejected. In ver. 31 we see clearly why Saul called Jonathan a "son of perverse rebellion." David is making a rebellious attempt on the royal throne, and Jonathan, bound to him in intimate friendship, is therefore a rebel. He calls this rebellion "perversity," because "as long as the son of Jesse lives on the earth, he (Jonathan) and his kingdom will not be established." It is therefore Saul's determined and permanent purpose to slay David as a rebel. And so he says: **Now send and fetch him to me, for he is a son of death.** These words fully reveal his disposition towards David.—Ver. 32. In spite of this outbreak of rage on his father's part Jonathan tries with mild and quiet words to set forth David's innocence and the injustice of putting him to death, as in **xix.** 4, 5. At that time Saul's better feeling got the upper hand. Here, completely enslaved by his passion, he is an impotent instrument of his own blind hate.—Ver. 33. As David before, so now Jonathan is the mark of his spear hurled [or, brandished,—Tr.], in blind rage (comp. xviii. 11). Jonathan saw that it was a settled thing with his father to kill David (comp. ver. 9).—Ver. 34. A vivid and psychologically true description of Jonathan's consequent conduct; he rises in fierce anger from the table, eats nothing this second day of the new moon (in contrast with the first, when he took part in the meal), and, what is the reason of his not eating, is grieved for David,* **because his father had done him shame** [that is, done David, not Jonathan shame.—Tr.]. That there is nothing of this in the text (Then.) cannot be maintained, for the way in which Saul spoke of the relation of Jonathan to David, and his indirect declaration that David was a rebel against him, the king, and therefore deserved death, was shame and insult enough. And that Jonathan thought this insult offered to his friend as a completely innocent man is clear from his question: Why shall he die? What has he done?

Vers. 35–42. [Heb. xxi. 1]. According to the agreement David is informed of Saul's attitude towards him, and, after a sorrowful parting with his friend, betakes himself to flight.

Ver. 35. The following morning Jonathan went to the field to meet David at the appointed place (לְמוֹעֵד ד), not "at the time agreed on," which translation requires too much to be supplied; and with him a *small servant* "who would not so easily suspect anything; this trifling notice is of great value as testimony to the historical realness of the occurrence"—(Then.).—Ver. 36. The narration is evidently abridged. Jonathan says to the servant: Bring the *arrows*. This plural answers to the agreement in ver. 20 sq., which seems to be contradicted by the following statement that Jonathan shot only *one* arrow (חֵצִי is ancient unshortened Sing. for later חֵץ, as in vers. 37, 38; 2 Ki. ix. 24; see Ew., § 186, 2 *e*). "To send it beyond him," so that the arrow went further than the servant had run.—Ver. 37. **To the place** (or, **the region**, Thenius) **of the arrow which Jonathan had shot,** according to the agreement with David, which referred to three arrows to be shot, Jonathan calls to the boy: "Is not the arrow beyond thee?" Jonathan uses a question instead of direct discourse (as in vers. 20–22) in order more certainly to make the boy believe that he was merely practicing at a mark. He heaps up words of command "hasten, hurry, stay not," to keep the boy's attention fixed on the arrow, that he might not chance to see David, who was hid near by. "The boy took up the arrow." The text (Sing.) is to be retained against the Qeri (Plu.), since the purpose is to tell of *one* arrow only. "He came (not as Sept. 'brought') to his master," that is, bringing the arrow. While in vers. 20–22 this procedure is summarily described of *three* arrows, the account here is of *one*. The difference is not to be explained by the supposition that Jonathan shortened the affair and shot only once, because there was danger in delay (Then.), for the shooting of three arrows was a principal point in the agreement, and if there had been such need of haste, the following parting-scene could not have taken place. Rather we must suppose that Jonathan did so with *each* of the three arrows. Either, as Bunsen remarks, Jonathan shot the arrows one right after another, or he thrice repeated it. In the first case we must hold with Keil that the Sing. here "stands in an indefinite general way, the author not thinking it necessary, after what he has before said, to state that Jonathan shot three arrows one after another."

Ver. 40. Jonathan, having given his artillery to the lad—we need not with Sept. read עַל for אֶל (Then.)—sent him to the city, that he might be alone with David.—Ver. 41. David rose from the south side of the rock, where he had been concealed, the preceding affair having occurred on the north side, whence the boy returned to the city which lay north of David's hiding-place, so that the latter was completely hid from him. It accords very well with this statement of the points of the compass that David afterward fled southward to Nob.* The affecting description of the sorrowful parting is in keeping with the deep emotion of these two hearts (one loving the other as himself) not merely on account of the separation, which was final, but on account of the great dangers and grievous sufferings which the one saw that the other must inevitably endure from Saul. "David fell on his face to the ground and bowed himself thrice." Clericus: "To do Jonathan honor, that he might implore his help or gratefully acknowledge his kindness." Josephus: "he did obeisance and called him the saviour of his life."—There is no need to render with Vulgate and Syriac (אַךְ for עַד): "*But* David wept still more," that is, than Jonathan. No sense can be extracted from the reading of the Septuagint "unto a great consummation" (*ἕως συντελείας μεγάλης*, according to Thenius from substitution of תֹּם for דָּוִד), which provokes from Capell the

* [*Bib. Comm.:* The generosity of Jonathan's character is seen in that he resented the wrong done to his friend, not that done to himself.—Tr.]

* [A point can hardly be made of this. David might just as well have fled in any other direction, and chose the south because he was naturally more familiar with the region where he was brought up.—See "Text. and Gram." for the difficulties of the text.—Tr.]

merry remark that, according to this, the two friends are still weeping, and will continue to weep till the last day.* We must render literally: "David did greatly,"—namely, wept violently, aloud. For the construction comp. Joel ii. 20, 21; Ps. cxxvi. 2, 3.—Ver. 42. Jonathan must quickly part from his weeping friend to spare him further danger. From the connection and the circumstances it is not probable that another conversation [of which Jonathan's words are merely the conclusion] had before taken place (Keil). Jonathan's parting word is: 1) a wish for peace or blessing, and 2) conjuring him that the covenant of friendship be forever maintained. The apodosis is not uttered; the aposiopesis accords with Jonathan's deep emotion.—Chap. xx. 1 [in Eng. A. V. xx. 42]. The concluding scene. David goes his way in flight; Jonathan returns in the opposite direction to the city.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. David designates the covenant of friendship which Jonathan had made with him (xviii. 1 sq.) as one which he made with him *in the Lord* (comp. xxiii. 18). It was therefore not a friendship which rested merely on mutual good feeling, but was based on a recognized common union of heart with the living God. Jonathan's heart clung in firm faith and trust to the Lord; this was the root of his heroic courage and his victorious prowess (comp. xiv. 6); this fresh power of faith, which elevated and sanctified his whole being, won him David's regard and love. David's whole life-course showed Jonathan the direct wonderful gracious leading of the Lord, to which he humbly submitted himself. The two hearts were one in looking to and hoping in the living God, in humble obedience to His holy will. This was the foundation of their communion of love and life in the Lord. "God works such unions through and in Himself, so that such souls become wholly one" (*Berl. Bib.*).

2. On the light of this noble friendship concluded in the Lord falls the shadow of the "lie of necessity" to which David resorts in order to save himself from Saul's murderous designs, and into which Jonathan allows himself to be enticed by David, having given the unconditional promise: "What thy soul says, I will do for thee." Yet the duty of absolute truthfulness could not be known so clearly from the stand-point of the Old Testament as from that of the New; of the same David who expressly said "Keep thy lips from speaking guile" (Ps. xxxiv. 14 [13]) precisely the opposite is here and elsewhere related. But though there is in the narrative no condemnation of the lie, the course of events brings a judgment on it; for Saul sees through it immediately. On Jonathan falls his father's rage (thereby roused), and Saul's anger burns the more violently against David. Instead of having recourse to a lie as a supposed necessary self-help, they ought to have united in unconditional trust in the Lord's help, and have committed their affairs to Him. Compare how the Lord formerly exposed and brought to naught the lies of Abraham and Isaac (Gen. xii. 11 sq.; xxvi. 7 sq.), and punished the lie of Rebecca and Jacob (Gen. xxvii. 6 sq.).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1 sqq. SCHLIER: The old saying is right:

> Silently suffer, forbear and endure,
> Thy troubles to no one lament;
> Despair not of God, for His promise is sure,
> And daily thy help will be sent.

But it is another thing when we are indeed silent to the world, but tell our troubles and conflicts to a faithful friend, when we communicate to others all that oppresses us, when we do not complain and lament, but do seek counsel and consolation. —STARKE: Even great-hearted men sometimes grow faint-hearted; let us therefore not build too much on ourselves, but on God, whose power is mighty in the weak (2 Cor. xii. 9; Ps. xxx. 8).—[Ver. 2. SCOTT: Pious children will veil the faults of their parents as far as consists with other duties, and speak as favorably of them as truth permits.—TR.]—Ver. 3. STARKE: Even in the midst of life we are in death.* O man, do think of it, and never feel secure (Ps. xxxix. 6).—[Ver. 4. Here friendship goes too far. It is wrong to promise unconditional compliance with the wishes of another. He may err in judgment and ask what is unwise, or may be misled by interest and ask what is wrong. And, besides, every man is solemnly bound to exercise his own judgment and conscience in the direction of his conduct. Jonathan was led by this promise to tell a falsehood, which his father detected, and was thereby the more enraged (vers. 28–33).—Ver. 6. TAYLOR: From brooding morbidly over Saul's treatment of him, to the entire exclusion from his mind of God's constant care over him, David fell into despair, and ran into a course of reckless deceit which brought the most fearful consequences in its train (chaps. xx.—xxii.).—TR.]—Ver. 8. STARKE: So long as one sees before him ordinary ways and means of escaping from danger, he should make use of them, and not look for extraordinary help from God, that he may not tempt God.—Ver. 10. S. SCHMID: A wise man not only proposes to himself to do good, but he looks around him for suitable means of accomplishing his good designs (Prov. xxi. 25–6).—Ver. 11. Conversations between friends united in the Lord upon the highest and holiest matters of the inner or the outer life are to be preserved from the disturbing influences of the unquiet world; the thoughts interchanged in stillness before the Lord and in the Lord unite their hearts in all the closer inward ties for time and eternity.—Ver. 13. All

* [The phrase συντέλεια is used in New Test. of the end of the world, as in Matt. xiii. 39 *al.*—TR.]

* [STARKE quotes this saying in substantially the form given it by LUTHER in a metrical version. We have substituted the form familiar to the English-speaking world from the *Book of Common Prayer*. LUTHER's hymn (KNAPP 2824, SCHAFF 446) derives its first stanza, with alterations, from an older German version. The original Latin is found in Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnologicus* II. 329, is certainly quite old, and believed by some to have been written by a monk who died A. D. 912. It was once a favorite battle-song. The first line is so famous that it may be well to insert the whole:

Media vita in morte sumus:
Quem quærimus adjutorem nisi te, domine,
Qui pro peccatis nostris iuste irasceris:
Sancte Deus, sancte fortis, sancte et misericors salvator:
Amaræ morti ne tradas nos.—TR.]

the highest and most blessed things that souls united in the Lord can wish for each other are included in the one word: The Lord be with thee; for what is greater and more blessed than the Lord's guidance and gracious presence?—Ver. 14. The kindness of the Lord itself exercises and employs the child of God as its instrument for his fellow-children and brethren; children of God love one another with and in the love of God which dwells in their hearts.—Ver. 15. BERLENB. BIBLE: A truly tranquil soul seeks neither honor nor advantage for itself. It is just as joyful when God is glorified in others as in itself. It only asks such a faithful friend, whom with joy it sees preferred before itself, that he will give it any help it may need in the spiritual life.—Ver. 17. DISSELHOFF: Unselfish love bears especially two noble fruits—to rejoice with them that rejoice, and to weep with them that weep. How heart-refreshingly do both of these beckon to us from the history of our two friends. Through David's glorious victory, Jonathan, who had before been highly praised by the people as a conqueror, fell wholly into the shade. He lost through David even his hope of the crown. Yet he looked with joyful eye upon the deeds of David and his growing fame.—[True love delights in receiving and giving repeated and strong assurances. This is very different from the renewed assurance which distrust demands.—TR.]—Ver. 23. S. SCHMID: What has been once promised and is not opposed to God must be held fast.—SCHLIER: A faithful friend is a gift of God, and God gives such a blessing to him that fears Him. The God-fearing David received from the Lord such a noble blessing of friendship as few others ever enjoyed.

Ver. 30 sqq. SCHLIER: We take up so easily with anger, and yet how fearful is the power of anger! How blind does anger make a man—how it carries him out of himself, so that he does not even know what he is doing; how it makes a man like a beast, so that he ceases to be himself, and falls under the power of darkness.—Vers. 35–40. STARKE [from HALL]: In vain are those professions of love which are not answered with action (1 John iii. 18).—Ver. 32. BERL. BIBLE: A friend in grace cannot possibly let himself be moved by self-advantage. When he has once let self-seeking go, in order to give himself to God, then nothing disturbs him of all that may be said or done against him. He well knows the essential deep ground of unity, which is in God alone. —Unity with favored souls draws after it also a like condition and like sorrow. So long as David is thy friend, thou must also have part in his cross.—[Ver. 34. SCOTT: Under great provocations the meekest cannot always refrain from anger; but when its emotions are felt, it is our wisdom to withdraw in silence; and it is generous to be more grieved for our insulted friends than for ourselves —TR.]—Ver. 41. S. SCHMID: In misfortune the love of true friends must much rather increase than fall off.—OSIANDER: The pious experience such weakness when they stand in fear of death or other trials, in order that they may know, when they have overcome misfortune, that they have done so not by their own strength, but that it is God's gift. Ver. 42. S. SCHMID: When we are separated from our dearest friends in the world, it is our consolation if we are not separated from God, but have Him for a friend (Ps. lxxiii. 25 sq.).—BERL. BIBLE: The unions that are made in God are for that reason the strongest of all. Nothing human forms their bond. Presence does not increase them, just as little as absence diminishes them. Thence comes it that such persons separate without pain if God so wills. They desire only one thing, namely, to maintain peace even amid the greatest antagonisms, since this peace is a sure sign that one has not withdrawn from submission to the will of God.

J. DISSELHOFF to chap. xx.: *Friendship among the servants of God.* Three questions: 1) Wherein is friendship among the servants of God grounded? —It is a covenant in the Lord. 2) What perils threaten even friendship among the servants of God?—That one friend, overlooking another's sin, may do for his sake what is not right in the sight of God. 3) What blessing rests upon friendship among the servants of God?—It teaches unenvying joy with them that rejoice, and faithful mourning and forbearing with them that mourn.

F. W. KRUMMACHER (1 Sam. xx. 16, 17): *Sanctified friendship:* The love of Jonathan for David is put to a severe test by a three-fold discovery which he makes: he gets a glimpse of the real *disposition* cherished by his royal father towards his friend, the heroic youth—of the high *destiny* which God designs for his beloved friend —and of the *danger* which threatens himself through his connection with David.

[Ver. 3 (end). A good funeral text in case of sudden death, especially when from accident.

Vers. 14, 15. *The friend's plea for kindness.* 1) Kindness notwithstanding separation and outward antagonism. 2) Kindness not merely on grounds of personal regard, but "kindness of Jehovah." 3) Kindness not only to himself, but also to his posterity.

Ver. 41. *Strong men weeping.* 1) Great occasion for it here. *a*) Personal separation. *b*) Mad injustice of their *father* (comp. xxiv. 16). *c*) Prospect of a bitter conflict. 2) Not unbecoming when on sufficient occasion. Compatible *a*) With manly courage and spirit. David and Jonathan were certainly brave. *b*) With great self-control (xvii. 29; xviii. 14; xx. 32). *c*) With living trust in Providence (v. 42).—TR.]

III. *David's flight to Nob to the high-priest Ahimelech and to Gath to king Achish.*

CHAP. XXI. 1–15 (2–16).

1 THEN came David [And D. came] to Nob to Ahimelech the priest. And Ahi-
melech was afraid at the meeting of David [Ahimelech went frightened to meet
David][1] and said unto him, Why art thou alone and no man with thee? And Da-
2 vid said unto Ahimelech the priest, The king hath commanded me a business and
hath said unto me, Let no man know any thing of the business[2] whereabout I send
thee and what [which] I have commanded thee; and I have appointed[3] *my* servants
3 [the young men] to such and such[4] a place. Now, therefore, what is under thy
4 hand? give me five *loaves of* bread in mine hand, or what there is present. And
the priest answered David and said, There is no common bread under mine hand,
but there is hallowed [holy] bread; if the young men have kept themselves at least[5]
5 from women. And David answered the priest and said unto him, Of a truth[6] wo-
men have been kept from us about these three days since I came out, and the ves-
sels of the young men are holy, and *the bread* is in a manner common, yea, though
6 it were sanctified this day in the vessel.[7] So [And] the priest gave him hallowed
[holy] *bread*, for there was no bread there but the show-bread, that was taken from
before the Lord [Jehovah], to put hot bread in the day when it was taken away.
7 Now [And] a certain man of the servants of Saul was there that day detained be-
fore the Lord [Jehovah], and his name was Doeg an [the] Edomite, the chiefest
8 of the herdsmen[8] that belonged to Saul [of Saul]. And David said to Ahimelech,
And is there not[10] here under thy hand spear or sword? for I have neither brought

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

1 [Ver. 1. לִקְרַאת supposes a verb of "going" before it.—TR.]

2 [Ver. 2. Literally "in respect to the business."—TR.]

3 [Ver. 2. יוֹדַעְתִּי Poel of יָדַע "to know"—"taught, instructed." Some take it as error for הוֹדַעְתִּי (Buxtorf.) not so well. Sept. διαμεμαρτύρημαι—יוֹעַדְתִּי, Poel of יָעַד, which is a better reading. The Syr. supports the Heb. text—other versions not decisive.—TR.]

4 [Ver. 2. Heb. "*Peloni almoni.*" This is translated by Syr. and Chald. "secret and hidden." Sept. (Vat.) has a duplet; it translates by θεοῦ πίστις, "faith of God," and transfers by "*Phellani mœmoni.*" On the derivation of the Heb. words see Ges. *Lex. s. v.* Fürst suggests that *peloni* may be from *palmoni*, and in the *Annot.* to Dan. viii. 13 in the *ed. princeps* of Codex Chis. the latter is held to be the original form, and is derived from the Egyptian Ammon (with prefix ל and Egypt. article—*pa. l. ammon—palmoni*), which is wholly improbable. Buxtorf (after Kimchi) says that the words here after "place" indicate a person: "to the place of such a one."—TR.]

5 [Ver. 4. Or: "have only kept themselves."—TR.]

6 [Ver. 5. More exactly "(nay) but women."—TR.]

7 [Ver. 5. On this sentence see Erdmann's *Exposition* and a long list of translations in Poole's *Synopsis*. The principal renderings are as follows: 1) "And though it is a profane (*i. e.*, military) way, yet it is sanctified to-day in the vessel" (*i. e.*, David or Ahimelech or the young men's body). Ewald: "how much more will *they* (the young men, changing the Numb. of the verb) be holy in the vessel" (*i. e.*, their bodies), since, namely, they were clean at starting, how much more now the third day! 2) "Though it is a profane (*i. e.*, ceremonially illegal) procedure (to take the show-bread), yet it is sanctified by the vessel (David or Ahimelech)"—so Thenius and Erdmann. 3) "If this is our way with profane things (*i. e.*, we have not defiled ourselves on the road), how much more will the bread now given us be kept holy in our vessels" (Philippson); 4) "And though this is the manner of common bread (*i. e.*, to give it to us), yet surely to-day the bread in the vessel (*i. e.*, the fresh show-bread) is holy" (*Bib. Comm.*). 5) "It (the show-bread) is in a manner profane, even though it were to-day sanctified" (Rashi, Eng. A. V.).—There is no good ground for changing the text, and the word "vessels" cannot be taken (according to O. T. usage) in the N. T. sense (2 Cor. iv. 7). It is a hurried, excited sentence, almost utterly obscure. The second rendering above given (that of Thenius, adopted by Erdmann) seems the least open to objection.—TR.]

8 [Ver. 7. Sept.: "the Syrian" (ר for ד).—TR.]

9 [Ver. 7. Sept. "keeper of the mules," רֹעֵה הַפְּרד, perhaps by inversion and misreading of the text; comp. the designation of Doeg in xxii. 9.—TR.]

10 [Ver. 8. אִין יֶשׁ is somewhat strange. Sept. ἴδε εἰ ἔστιν—רְאֵה הֲיֵשׁ (Wellh.), Chald. "if there is here!" Syr. "is there not (לַיְת)?" Vulg. *si habes hic.* Gesen. supposes that the Interrog. הֲ has fallen out. We may perhaps take אִין as Interrog.—אִי.—TR.]

my sword nor my weapons with me, because the king's business required haste.
9 And the priest said, The sword of Goliath the Philistine whom thou slewest in the
valley of Elah, behold it is *here* [*om.* here] wrapped in a cloth [the garment] be-
hind the ephod; if thou wilt take that, take it, for there is no other save that here.
And David said, There is none like that; give it me.[11]
10 And David arose and fled that day for fear of[12] Saul, and went to Achish the
11 king of Gath. And the servants of Achish said unto him, Is not this David the
king of the land? did they not sing one to another of him in dances, saying, Saul
12 hath slain his thousands and David his ten thousands? And David laid up these
13 words in his heart, and was sore afraid of Achish the king of Gath. And he
changed[13] his behaviour [understanding] before them [in their eyes] and feigned
himself mad [acted like a madman] in their hands, and scrabbled [scrawled][13] on
14 the doors of the gate, and let his spittle fall down upon his beard. Then said
Achish [And Achish said] unto his servants, Lo, ye see the man is mad; wherefore
15 *then* [*om.* then] have ye brought [do ye bring] him to me? Have I need of mad
men, that ye have brought this *fellow* to play the madman in my presence? shall
this *fellow* come into[14] my house?

[11] [Ver. 9. Sept. adds "and he gave it to him" a natural completion of the transaction, but the omission of a self-understood act like that is also natural.—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 10. Literally: "from the face of."—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 13. On these words see Erdmann. For the first Wellh. proposes to read וַיְשַׁנֶּה.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 15. Literally: "unto."—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 2–10 [Eng. A. V. 1–9]. *David flees to Nob to the high-priest Ahimelech.*

Ver. 2 (1). According to 1 Sam. xxii. 11, 19, 32; 2 Sam. xxi. 16; Isa. x. 32; Neh. xi. 32, the name of this refuge of David is Nob. (The Heb. form here and xxii. 9 is with ה local (with short vowel) after a verb of coming, Ges. § 90, 2.) According to xxii. 19 Nob was at this time a priestly city. Here at this time was the tabernacle, which, as we under David and Solomon find it in Gibeon, was probably carried thither in consequence of the destruction of Nob by Saul (ch. xxii.). The position of Nob is no longer determinable—only from Isa. x. 28–33 we know that it was near Jerusalem on the road northward between Anathoth (Anata) and Jerusalem in the tribe of Benjamin (Neh. xi. 32). According to Jerome (on Isa. *l. c.*), in whose time nothing remained of the place, Jerusalem was visible from it. Whether it stood on the site of the present village El Isawieh, between Anata and Jerusalem, about two and a half miles from the latter, and as far south-east of Gibeah of Saul (Tuleil el Ful), which Tobler (*Topog. von Jerus.* II. 719 sq.) describes, as Kiepert (Map to Rob.'s *Researches*) and Raumer (*Paläst.* p. 215, 4 ed.) [and Grove] suppose, cannot be decided; the objection is that Jerusalem is not visible from this place.*—See Herz. *R.-E.* and Winer *s. v.*—Thither David betook himself, as the nearest place of refuge from Gibeah, where he might for the present find shelter and concealment with the priests. From xxii. 10–14 [15] it appears, though it is not mentioned here, that he wished in this holy place to inquire God's will concerning his further way. He wished besides to provide himself with arms and food for his continued flight. His stay there was therefore intended to be temporary, as his whole conduct shows. We may assume that he stood in intimate relations with the priests there, and especially with their head, from whom therefore he expected not only the announcement of the divine will, but also consolatory and strengthening words.—*Ahimelech* is the same person with Ahiah (xiv. 3), son of Ahitub (xxii. 9, 20), the elder brother of Ichabod, son of Phinehas, son of Eli, therefore great-grandson of Eli. His son was the high-priest Abiathar (xxx. 7), with whom he is confounded in Mark ii. 26.* The designation "priest" here =high-priest, as in xiv. 3.—He is frightened at David's appearing alone, without retinue or arms; therefore he went to meet him *fearfully*, supposing such an appearance to be a sign of impending misfortune. We must presume that he knew of Saul's hatred to David, but not of the most recent occurrences. David must have feared that if he told the high-priest of these, the latter, for fear of bringing Saul's wrath on himself, would refuse him refuge. Therefore he has recourse here again to a lie; he pretends that the king has given him a secret commission, of which no one is to know, and represents to the high-priest that he has appointed his men some place at which to meet him. Maurer: "I ordered my servants to go to a certain place." (יוֹדַעְתִּי is Po. of ידע, "to know"="appoint.") "At such and such a place," comp. Ruth iv. 1. Clericus remarks that he really took some faithful followers with him, at least to the Philistine border, and during his stay in Nob assigned them to some place, where he would meet them, and Keil supposes that he left his few attendants (ver. 3 [2]) near by, in

* [So Hackett in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, Art. "Nob." Porter (*Hand-book* II. 327, ed. of 1868) identifies Nob with a conical tell opposite Shafat, where are remains of a small, but apparently ancient town, with cisterns and a tower, whence Mount Zion is visible.—Tr.]

* [On possible explanations of this, see Comms. of Lange and Alexander *in loco*, and Hackett in Note to Art. "Abiathar" in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, and on the general chronological difficulties see Comms. on 2 Sam. viii. 17 and 1 Chron. xviii. 16; xxiv. 3, 6, 31.—Tr.]

order to speak privately with the high-priest; but against this is the fact that in his flight, after his interview without witness with Jonathan (ch. xx.), there is no mention of any attendant, nor afterwards in his flight to Gath. He seeks to quiet Ahimelech's apprehension by the double statement that his commission is secret, and that he has appointed his people a place to stay. Clericus' remark: "all these things are inventions," is to be accepted of everything, not merely of his commission from the king.—[But in Mark ii. 25, 26, it is asserted that there were men with David, and it is in itself natural and probable that a man of his high official position and popularity should find some willing to share his flight. —Tr.]—Ver. 4 (3). **Now, what thou hast in hand, the five loaves, give me,** a request in keeping with David's hurry and eagerness. (מַה־יֵּשׁ is not a question, which would require something like לֶאֱכֹל (Then.) to follow.) He asks for *five loaves* with apparent reference to his retinue, but really for his own needs, since his way would lead him into the wilderness, and he must avoid meeting men.—Vers. 5 (4). **No common bread—but holy bread have I here,** answers Ahimelech. The five loaves which Ahimelech then had were a part of the twelve loaves which were laid up in the tabernacle, as the offering of the Twelve Tribes to the Lord. before his face, and thence called "Bread of presence, show-bread" (Ex. xxv. 30; xxxv. 13; xxxix. 36; xl. 23). They had just been taken away (ver. 7 [6]) to be replaced by fresh ones (Lev. xxiv. 8). The legal precept was that this bread, as something most holy, could be eaten only by the priests in the holy place (Lev. xxiv. 9). Ahimelech's answer to David therefore means that if he is here to make an exception to this rule, he must at least insist on ceremonial purity as a condition.—**If the men have only kept themselves from women.** See Lev. xv. 18. Thereby the principle of the legal prescription of levitical purity was satisfied, inasmuch as the circumstances—namely, the lack of ordinary bread, the haste which the alleged important commission of the king required, the duty of aiding in its execution as much as possible, and the pious behaviour of David in inquiring the Lord's will at the holy place—seemed to justify a deviation from the rule concerning the eating of the show-bread. But it is inferring too much from this isolated case when Clericus remarks: "It is clear from Ahimelech's demand as to women that the eating of the consecrated bread was not absolutely forbidden to the laity in case of urgent necessity." See Matt. xii. 3, where the Lord uses this example to justify divergence from the letter of the Law when its outward observance would violate the inner spirit of the Law and hinder the fulfilment of sacred duties to one's self and one's neighbor.— Ver. 6 (5). In David's answer the introductory "*but*" (כִּי אִם) relates to the negative in Ahimelech's last words: "they are not unclean, *but;*" we may therefore render "*rather*" [Eng. A. V. "of a truth."] David affirms the purity of his men and of himself in this regard: "Women have been kept from us." The following words from "since I came out" to "in the vessel" present many difficulties. The "*came out*" may be connected with the preceding or the following context. In favor of the former it may be said that it naturally connects itself with the phrase "yesterday and the day before" [= about these three days] as an exacter statement of time; David says: "this abstinence has existed from the day of my departure till now." In fact this connection is necessary in order to establish the assertion that the men had refrained from women since "yesterday and the day before," for from the day of departure it could not be otherwise. S. Schmid: "in the words 'yesterday and the day before' David seems to refer to his three days' hiding in the field or in Bethlehem." Further we have to consider the meaning of the words "vessel" (כְּלִי) and "way" (דֶּרֶךְ). As to the former, the reference here to purity of body does not justify us in understanding it figuratively of the body, as σκεῖος in 2 Cor. iv. 7; 1 Thess. iv. 4 (Ewald), for the word never has this sense in Hebrew literature. Bunsen: "that is certainly not Hebrew usage." Keil, expressly departing from the usual meaning "vessels," takes the word (from Deut. xxii. 5) in the sense of "clothing," and with reference to Lev. xv. 18 (on the defilement of "garments" by seminal discharge) makes David say: "The garments of my men were clean." But the word cannot mean "garment" in Deut. xxii. 5 (where it is in the Sing.); it never means garment as such, as we should here have to take it in the supposed reference to defilement by seminal flow. But what would be the bearing of such a remark after David had already affirmed that, in consequence of their removal from women, no such defilement could be found in them?—We must do what we can with the usual meaning of the word "*implement, vessel.*" The "vessels of the men" = apart from their arms, everything that pertained to personal preparation for the journey; see Jer. xlvi. 19, כְּלֵי גוֹלָה, "exile-gear," [Eng. A. V. "furnish thyself to go into captivity."] So S. Schmid: "the reference is to packs and sacks for food for the journey." Such leathern and other articles might as well as persons become unclean, according to the Law, Lev. xi. 32 sq.; xiii. 47 sq. Comp. Sommer, *bibl. Abhandlung, "Rein und Unrein"* [Clean and Unclean], p. 204, 211, 223. The gear or baggage of the men, as well as their persons, might be unclean. But the holy bread, which even exceptionally could be eaten only by levitically clean persons, could not be carried in vessels which were legally unclean. David therefore says that the vessels of his men were holy at starting, in order to assure Ahimelech that there was not the slightest legal objection to their taking the bread, nothing unclean either in their persons or in their baggage. So the Vulg.: "and the vessels (*vasa*) of the young men were holy." S. Schmid: "David means to say: since we have just left home, whence people usually take clean things, you may readily suppose that no impurity has been contracted; it would be different if we were returning home from a journey, where on the way, especially in war, uncleanness might be contracted by the blood of enemies, or otherwise."—The rendering of the

Sept. "all the young men" (כֹּל for כְּלִי), adopted by Thenius as a necessary emendation, is suspicious from its easiness, and must be rejected, since we can derive a good sense from the text.—We have next to examine the meaning of the word "way."* In the first place, no explanation is allowable which does not maintain the reference to the subject in hand, namely, the showbread. We reject therefore those explanations in which this word is made to mean the *way* in which David was going, and the last word (כְּלִי) = "gear." Vulg.: "and this way is unclean, but itself also will be sanctified to-day in the vessels." So the Sept.—Maurer: "I am sure that it (the way) is sanctified to-day," *etc.* De Wette: "and if the way is unholy, it is to-day sanctified by the vessels." Dathe and Schulz: "though the journey is undertaken on profane business." O. v. Gerlach and Keil: "though it is an unholy way that we go, namely, in performing the king's commission." From the connection one does not at all see how the way, or the undertaking is unholy, profane. To supply: "the way has no religious object" (O. v. Gerl.), "ordinary business, not ecclesiastical" (Ew.), is to insert a new idea into the words. Nor does the connection warrant O. v. Gerl. and Keil (taking כְּלִי as Sing. in the sense of "instrument, organ") in making David say: "The way was holy before God, since it was through necessity trodden by him, God's chosen servant, the upholder of God's true kingdom in Israel, the way was sanctified through him as instrument, as ambassador of the Lord's Anointed." Thenius rightly says that the words must contain a remark by which the priest is to be induced to give the bread, and that it is important to keep in mind the *Sing.* "vessel," which has not always been regarded. Clericus is quite correct in saying: "*way* is everywhere used for the *manner of doing* a thing." But he is wrong in taking "way" = "somehow" (*aliquo modo*), supplying "bread" [as Eng. A. V.], and, with the remark that otherwise there is no sense in the passage, explaining: "This holy bread, removed from the presence of the Lord, had become *in some sort* (*aliquo modo*) profane, because *other* (bread) was to be substituted for it that day, and this was now sanctified in the vessels in which it was to be placed, that it might be carried into the holy place, and set on the table;" this is an arbitrary and violent treatment of the words, and moreover, gives no clear sense—apart from the fact that it is not true that the bread, when taken from the table, thereby becomes profane, since, even when so removed, it remains the consecrated bread, for the eating of which levitical purity is a necessary condition. So the translation of S. Schmid "but itself (the bread) is of the nature of profane (bread), yet it will be holily carried in the vessel," is neither in accordance with the words nor at all intelligible. The word "*way*" = conduct, mode of procedure, here refers to the *procedure* demanded by David, by which the high-priest was, contrary to the legal prescription, to give the showbread to persons who were not priests; "though it is an unholy procedure, yet *to-day* it becomes holy through the *instrument*." The Heb. word (כְּלִי "instrument, organ") is so used of *men* also, Gen. xlv. 5; Isa. xiii. 5; xxxii. 7; Jer. l. 25; comp. σκεῦος, Acts ix. 15. The *instrument* is here the sacred person of the priest, Ahimelech himself, as bearer of the high-priestly dignity. So also Thenius. The "*to-day*" points with emphasis to the special circumstances of that day, which induced Ahimelech to grant David's request. The "yea, verily" (אַף כִּי, so xiv. 30) is in keeping with the excitement with which David speaks, in order to persuade the high-priest.—Ver. 7 (6). The priest yields to David's representation, and gives him the "holy." Lack of other bread is expressly said to be the reason of his compliance, he departed from the legal prescription through sheer necessity only. It seems to be mentioned as an alleviating fact, that the bread had already been taken away from before the Lord, having remained on the table in the holy place seven days according to the Law (Lev. xxiv. 6–9); "*to-day*" was the "*day of removal*," that is, when it was exchanged for fresh bread. It is probable that in the "to-day" of ver. 6 (5) there is a reference to this "day of removal."

Ver. 8 (7). Mention of a servant of Saul, Doeg the Edomite, which brings the narrative into pragmatic connection with xxii. 9 sq., and at the same time exhibits the divine providence, by which David's lie, intended to conceal his real position and flight from Saul, proved useless, rather led to the destruction of Nob and its inhabitants. **A man of the servants of Saul.**—These words stand significantly first, in order to show that, in spite of David's trouble to conceal his way from Saul, the latter received information of his visit to this very place. "Detained, shut in (נֶעְצָר), before the Lord," not *continens se*, "lingering, remaining" (S. Schmid); that is, detained for some religious or ceremonial purpose, housed at the holy place, whether as a proselyte received by circumcision, or in fulfilment of a vow, or received for a purification-offering, or on account of a temporary Nazarite-vow, or for suspected leprosy (Lev. xiii. 4); in any case, as one "who was committed to the custody of the priests ministering in the tabernacle" (Cler.). Vulg.: "Within the tabernacle." **His name was Doeg, the Edomite**, "he had probably come over to Saul in his war with Edom," (Ew.).*—His official position was "Ruler *over the herdsmen of Saul*." Vulgate: "Most powerful of Saul's herdsmen," and so all ancient versions except Sept., which has wrongly νέμων τὰς ἡμιόνους "tending the mules of Saul." (רֹעֶה אֶת־פִּרְדֵי שׁ). On account of the importance which still attached in Saul's time to the possession of herds as a family-power, Doeg's position as Overseer of Herds and Herdsmen must have been a prominent one.—Ver. 9 (8). Besides food, David needed *arms*. That in such pressing danger he fled without arms is to be explained on the ground that he "feared that he would be recognized, or, as an armed man concealing himself,

* [Rendered incorrectly in Eng. A. V. (and by others) "in a manner."—Tr.]

* [On rabbinical opinions about Doeg see Philippson in "*Die Israel. Bibel*" *in loco*.—Tr.]

be suspected" (Cler.)—or that he fled in great haste. This last is the reason he gives to Ahimelech, carrying out his pretence about the royal commission: "I did not bring my sword and weapons, because the king's business was hasty," literally "pressed" (נָחוּץ), stronger than "pressing." Vulg.: "the king's word was urgent;" Sept.: "in haste" (κατὰ σπουδήν).—"*Hast thou not here spear or sword?*" a question which, like the demand for bread above, clearly reveals in part David's haste, in part his anxiety to conceal by a light tone the pressing danger of his situation.—Ver. 10 (9). The priest answers by referring to the sword of Goliath, with which David had slain him in the Terebinth-valley (xvii. 2). To preserve it from dust, moisture and rust it was carefully wrapped in a garment or cloth, and kept in the holy place behind the priestly ephod (not hung on a nail (Ew.), but in a safe and visible place). How it came hither, David having carried Goliath's armor to his tent, that is, taken possession of it (xvii. 54), is nowhere said. There is no contradiction of the earlier statement; the apparent difference is removed "by the perfectly natural supposition that David carried home Goliath's armor *except his sword*, or that this sword was *afterwards* deposited for safe keeping in the national sanctuary" (Then.) See on xvii. 54. (כָּמֹהָ for כָּמוֹהָ, *here only.*)—David here declared the particular value of this sword for him, thinking, undoubtedly, of its importance for his whole life in connection with that deed of heroism. He thus received not merely a weapon, but, by the divine arrangement, "a holy weapon, promising victory" (O. v. Gerl.).

Vers. 11–16 [10–15]. *Provided with arms and bread David flees to Gath to the Philistine king Achish.*—Ver. 11 (10). The **that day** shows that David stayed in Nob only long enough to consult the oracle and procure arms and food; the same day that he arrived he continued his flight. We do not know whether he had already determined to go to Philistia, or now first suddenly resolved on it, possibly in consequence of Doeg's unexpected appearance. The words **he fled before Saul** do not mean that this flight began with his departure from Nob (Keil), for in the narrative of his parting from Jonathan (and indeed before that) we see him in flight. The expression "*from before Saul*" indicates the significance of his further flight in respect to Saul as his king and lord, in that he now entirely abandons actual subjection to him, appearing as a deserter to king Achish and into a foreign country. This expression does not require us to regard this section (vers. 11–16 [10–15]) as coming from another source and here *arbitrarily* interpolated (Thenius). Even supposing (as is possible) that the section is from another source than the preceding, in which not the account of Saul's schemes and David's flight from the beginning is given, but only this flight to Philistia, it does not appear that the words "David fled that day from Saul" are an arbitrary interpolation. However, this opinion rests on the view that the flight here is the same as that in chap. xxvii., only in the form of a popular story, and here inappositely inserted, while the correct recension is given in ch. xxvii., where it is suitably put in David's time of extremest need towards the end of his fugitive wandering (Then.). But the difference of the circumstances is an objection to identifying this flight with that in chap. xxvii.—especially that *here* David goes to the Philistines *alone* and tries for some time to gain a safe residence by feigning madness, while *there* [ch. xxvii.] he goes with his family and a numerous retinue, and gains the favor of the Philistine king by numerous military undertakings and expeditions. Nor can it be admitted that the narrative in vers. 11–16 [10–15] is historically improbable, and therefore has no *historical* value. It is said that David would not in the beginning of his flight have taken the step of going over to the Philistines, which was possible only in extremest necessity; but, we answer, the expression "extremest necessity" is a very indefinite one, and further, as appears from the connection, David's inner excitement, consequent on Saul's enduring murderous hate and present intense rage, from which he could never feel safe in his own land, made his need and danger seem to him so great and pressing, that a flight over the border cannot appear in the least historically untrustworthy. He thought that appearing as a deserter he would be safest with Saul's enemy. That is psychologically easily intelligible. But, as he could not even thus mollify the hatred and suspicion of the Philistines, he was obliged to play the madman; nor does this bring him security, his stay is a very short one,—this is all truly historical, these are traits of real life, which oppose the supposition that we here have an improbable unhistorical narration. As to the objection from Goliath's sword, that, as well-known to the Philistines, it would certainly have betrayed David, Nägelsbach justly remarks (*Herz.* XIII. 403), that it is said in xxi. 9 only that David took it from Nob, not that he carried it to Gath.* He needed a weapon immediately for the long and possibly dangerous road to the Philistine border; on the way he might provide himself with other arms, so that, if he needed weapons on the other side, he might not betray himself by the sword of Goliath.—In the title to Ps. xxxiv. the Philistine king is called *Abimelech*, which along with Achish was the standing official name of the Philistine princes of Gath (comp. Gen. xxvi. 1).—Ver. 12 [11]. The courtiers soon recognize the fugitive, though some time had elapsed since his victorious combat with Goliath. Let the situation be considered: David must have been an object of astonishment, and his appearance as fugitive and deserter an object of wonder to the Philistines, who knew what he had done for his country by that heroic exploit. Hence first, such talk, as is here narrated, *about him* (אֵלָיו [Eng. A. V. "unto him"]), which phrase from the connection (their thoughts and talk naturally turning on David) refers to David, not to Achish.†—**Is this not David, the king of the land?**—This question exhibits the great impression which David's exploit had made on the Philistines in their ideas concerning his position in his nation and country. They call him king of the land

* [To which it may be added that, even if he carried the sword to Gath, he might have kept it concealed during his stay there.—Tr.]

† [So Maurer: *De eo*, but other Comms. and ancient vss., as Eng. A. V.—Tr.]

"because David had appeared as such in taking up Goliath's challenge, and had thrown Saul entirely into the shade" (Then.).* This impression was favored by their recollection of the song of triumph, in which David was honored *above* Saul, and which was still well known to them. **Sang they not of him in dances?**—See xviii. 7. With this astounding recollection is connected the apprehension that this dangerous enemy of the Philistine people comes with evil intent. The supposition that with these words of ver. 12 (11) the courtiers introduced David into Achish's presence (Thenius) is nowhere supported, is improbable from the form of the words, which rather indicate the immediate impression made on them by David's appearance, and is untenable from David's consequent behaviour, (ver. 13 (12)). Then, *for the first time*, David lays them to heart and reflects on them, and *then fear* of *Achish* comes over him. He sees that he is recognized, and fears that, if the courtiers remind the king of the past, they will take vengeance on him and kill him. Therefore, when brought to the king as a dangerous enemy, he suddenly resorts to the device of *acting as a madman*. This would have been an absurd procedure, if he had already been presented to Achish by the courtiers, and so was already acquainted with them. Rather it must be supposed that, at the moment when David heard those words, the above reflection occurred to him, and he straightway determined on and carried out this simulation, before the servants of Achish could suspect that he was only pretending. **He changed his sense** [ver. 14 (13)], he perverted his understanding (Luther wrongly, after Sept. and Vulg., "his features"),† feigned madness; the same words are found in the title of Ps. xxxiv. (The apparently superfluous suffix in וַיְשַׁנּוֹ is *either* to be taken as *reflexive*, and the following worl *explicative* or objective, "he changed himself, his spiritual being, in respect to his understanding" (Then.), or with Keil we must explain it "from the circumstantial character of common popular speech, as in 2 Sam. xiv. 6, and in the not quite analogous cases Ex. ii. 6; Prov. v. 22; Ezek. x. 3, (comp. Ges. *Gr.*, § 121, 6 *Rem.* 3").—The following words show that David played the part of an *insane* person. The view of some older expositors (and recently Schlier) that by God's permission, under the excitement produced by fear and anguish of soul, David really fell into temporary insanity, is in direct contradiction to the words of the narrative. **He moved hither and thither like a madman** [Heb., "played the madman."—Tr.]. Thenius refers to Jer. xxv. 16; li. 7; Neh. ii. 5, **under their hands**, they seeking to hold the madman. **He smote (drummed on) the gate-doors**, so we must read with Sept. and Vulg. instead of "scribbled" (וַיְתֹף from תָּפַף instead of וַיְתָו from תָּוָה), the latter not being the gesture of a madman, and not agreeing with the last word:‡ **And he let his spittle fall on his beard.** This is to be understood of the foam which comes from the mouth of madmen.—Vers. 15, 16 [14, 15]. By his pretended madness David was safe from the servants of Achish, since in ancient times the persons of madmen were looked on as inviolable, in a certain sense as sacred. Danger from Achish he likewise avoided by so cleverly counterfeiting insanity when brought before the king, that the latter declared he should not come to his court, he had already mad folks enough.* **Behold, ye see.**—This expression shows the impression that David's gestures made on the king, so that he did not doubt that he had a madman before him. **A man who acts insanely**, that is, not "who so represents himself," but who objectively exhibits himself as a madman. For the question of reproach: **Why do ye bring him to me?** the reason is first given in the question, ver. 16 [15]: **Have I need,** *etc.* . . . **to play the madman against me?**—The Prep. (עָלַי) = not *in my presence* (De Wette), but *against* me. Achish fears personal harm from him. With the third question: **Shall this fellow come into my house?** he thrusts him away. David's plan, to remain unknown and concealed among the Philistines, did not succeed; but he succeeded in so simulating madness as to escape the dangerous situation into which he had gotten so soon as he was recognized as the victorious enemy of the Philistines. [From this narrative it appears that David and the Philistines understood one another's language, as on other grounds it is probable that the Hebrew and Philistine dialects were nearly identical.—Tr.]

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The more the history of David's providential guidance in this troublous time unfolds itself, the more gloriously does his God-devoted, humbly-obedient spirit shine forth out of this gloomiest period of his life. But the prophetic-historical narrative is so little concerned to make prominent this light in David's life, that it contents itself with a simple presentation of facts, and with equal freedom from tendentiousness† and prepossession, brings out sharp and unsoftened the dark spots in David's moral conduct. On the one hand David shows, in this time of hard trial and waiting, passive resignation to God's will and complete abnegation of his own will, and though he is sure of his calling to be king of Israel, he takes no steps at all to realize his calling by his own efforts against Saul. But, on the other hand, we see him falling into great fear in Nob and Gath (as formerly in his interview with Jonathan), his strong faith tottering, himself resorting to lies and pretence, and putting self-help, unbecoming an obedient servant of God, in the place of the Lord's help. In his deviation from truth for a good end he follows the principle often expressed by the Greek poets, *e. g.*, Eurip.: "ὅτῳ δ' ὄλεθρον

* [It is noticeable that Goliath's name is not mentioned by the Philistines, perhaps from natural indisposition to recall a grievous calamity, and out of regard for Goliath's family and friends.—Tr.]

† [Luther has *geberde* = mien, gestures, the Sept. has πρόσωπον and the Vulg. *os*.—Tr.]

‡ [On this reading see "Text. and Gram." David might have learned the signs of madness from his association with Saul.—Tr.]

* [According to Jewish tradition or fancy the wife and daughter of Achish were insane (Philippson).—Tr.]

† [We have no word in English to express the German *tendenz-schrift*, "a writing which has a special aim or object" (in politics or religion), and the adjective tendenziös, *tendentious*, "having a tendency or aim, written in the interest of some idea." Here it would set forth that the Book of Samuel was written for the purpose of glorifying David.—Tr.]

δεινὸν ἡ ἀλήθει' ἄγει συγγνωστὸν εἰπεῖν ἐστι καὶ τὸ μὴ καλόν ["when truth brings ruin it is pardonable to speak untruth."] Hamann: "The Holy Spirit is become the chronicler of men's foolish, yea, sinful actions. He has narrated the lies of an Abraham, the incest of Lot, the simulation of a man after God's heart. O God, Thy wisdom, by counsel which no reason can sufficiently wonder at and honor, has made the foolishness of men our instructor unto Christ, our glory in Christ."—Grotius: "Something must be forgiven those times, when eternal life was scarcely known."

2. Though the national sanctuary could not be re-established in Nob for the whole people, yet the high-priest and the other priests resided there, the will of God was inquired by Urim and Thummim, the legal prescriptions relating to worship were carried out as far as possible; and though the ark was wanting in the tabernacle, the latter was still regarded as the visible symbol of God's gracious presence. And so, though there were several centres of worship (see on ch. vii. 5), Nob was the most prominent of them, and with its incomplete arrangements was a substitute for the sanctuary for whose legal completeness for the whole people the presence of the ark was necessary. This more general significance for the whole people Nob had not merely by the presence of the ark, but also by the sacred vessels and arrangements connected with it. Among these were the twelve loaves of *showbread* according to the number of the twelve tribes on the sacred table appointed for them; for these were a covenant-sign to set forth Israel's permanent consecration in obedience and in producing the fruit of good works, which were offered to the Lord as His well-pleasing food.

3. The precepts of the Old Testament law were the outer shell of eternally valid demands of God's holy will on the will of His people. That the bread, consecrated by its holy meaning and use, could be eaten only by clean males of the priestly order in the holy place, was only the clothing of the [real] requirement, which read: only when you keep yourselves pure from the stain of sin and disobedience, and sanctify yourselves to me in heart, life, and walk, are ye in My sight a truly priestly people, and have part in the enjoyment of the gifts and goods of My house, and are members of My kingdom. The outer form and shell, the letter of the legal precept *might* be broken, if only the content, the essence was maintained; yea, this outer form, inadequate to the eternal ethical spiritual content of the Law, *must* be broken through, when its external preservation involved the violation or destruction of the essence and inner kernel. The duty of self-preservation justified David in eating the show-bread, to which, according to the letter of the law, he was not entitled; neighborly love required Ahimelech to deviate from the outer prescription in order to help the needy fugitive.* Both acted in the higher sense as priests. On this Christ grounded the application of this instance to Himself and His disciples, who broke the sabbath-law by plucking corn (Matt. xii. 3; Mark ii. 26; Luke vi. 3). "The Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath-day,"—in Him, and by communion with Him, in the power of His Spirit, is the true fulfilment of the eternal will of God hidden in Old Testament precepts, so that redeemed and sanctified man stands no longer under the disciplinary form of the law, but stands above and controls the form of the requirement. Even the Old Testament ritual law itself pointed involuntarily beyond itself to the fulfilment of its hidden truths and ideas by regulations and injunctions which of necessity violated the legal ordination [Matt. xii. 5]. The rabbis themselves well say: "In the sanctuary is no sabbath; sacrifice abolishes the sabbath."

4. The history of David's flight to the Philistines, and his escape thence by simulating madness, is, in the first place, the basis of Ps. xxxiv., which bears the title: "*By David, when he changed his understanding before Abimelech, and he drove him away and he departed.*" This title agrees precisely with the principal points of the narrative in 1 Sam. xxi. 11–16, and is, as it were, a brief compendium of it. The Abimelech of the title is identical with the Achish of the history, for the former name was the *nomen dignitatis* of all the Philistine kings, like Pharaoh among the Egyptians and Agag among the Amalekites. So Basilius in *Euthym. Zigab.* in the Introduction to this Ps. Comp. Hengst. *Beiträge* [Contributions] III., 306 sq., and Introduction to this Ps. That the private name should appear in the history, and the official name in the title of the Ps., is perfectly natural.—The Psalm, however, contains no express reference to the history, but is rather didactic and reflective; it contains: vers. 2–4 (1–3) a vow to praise God continually, and an exhortation to the pious to unite in this praise, vers. 5–11 (4–10), the reason for this vow and exhortation, namely, personal deliverance from great *fear* and *danger*, then vers. 12–23 (11–22), the teaching that only through the fear of God is one saved in time of need. This didactic poem, with its reflective, gnomic character and its alphabetic arrangement, cannot have been produced contemporaneously with the events of the history; but we cannot on this account, and from the absence of direct references to the history, reject the Davidic authorship, if we keep in view its genuine Davidic features and the concurrence of some of its thoughts and expressions with undoubtedly Davidic Psalms (see Moll on the *Psalter* [in Lange's *Biblework*]). The content is a reflection of that experience of David of divine help (set forth in this history), which sunk so deep into his soul, and an application of it to the instruction, consolation, and edification of the pious. The difference in the Philistine king's name shows indeed that the writer of the title did not have our history before him, and must have had other authority for referring the Ps. to this occurrence; this authority we may with Delitzsch and Moll hold to be the written tradition in the Annals of David, this Psalm, like others (as 2 Sam. xxii. 1 compared with Ps. xviii. shows) being found in the historical account, which is given in the title in the words of that authority.*—To the same

* [But the priest did not know that David was a fugitive; he helped him as an official of the king in momentary need. Whether David, as an official person, could not have gotten food elsewhere, does not appear.—Tr.]

* [As, however, the name Abimelech may be otherwise accounted for (see Smith's *Bib.-Dict.*, *s. v.* Abimelech), and the opinion of Basil is of doubtful authority,

dangerous situation of David refers *Psalm* lvi., the words of the title "when the Philistines took him in Gath" being confirmed by the expression in our history "in their hands," ver. 14 (13). Compare also ver. 9 (8) of the Psalm: "Thou countest my flight," or "hast counted my fugitive life" (Moll). From the recollection of these dangers David colors the portraiture of his dangers from his enemies, but at the same time exhibits throughout the Psalm confidence in God's help and faith in God's support, closing with a vow of thanksgiving for the divine aid, which he with assurance expects, through which he will walk before God in the light of life.—"When David sang these two songs, God's grace had already dried his tears. Their fundamental tone is thanksgiving for favor and deliverance. But he who has an eye therefor will observe that they are still wet with tears, and cannot fail to see in the singer's outpourings of heart the sorrowfulest recollections of former sins and errors" (F. W. Krummacher).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1. SCHLIER: When David finds no more help in the world, he goes to the Lord and His sanctuary. There he hopes certainly to find counsel and consolation. The Lord's word has counsel and consolation for all the necessities and perplexities of our life—and he who heartily seeks and longs for the Lord's word finds what he wants.—Ver. 2. [From HALL]: God lets us see some blemishes in His holiest servants, that we may neither be too highly conceited of flesh and blood, nor too much dejected when we have been miscarried into sin.]—SCHLIER: How good it would be if we should never indeed imitate David's "lie of necessity," but should always lay to heart the fact that in his need he betook himself to the sanctuary in Nob.—J. DISSELHOFF: It is one thing to show faith when a single wave of trouble rolls in upon us, and another to continue in faith when wave after wave bursts upon us, and the terrified eye sees spreading out before it an endless sea. This latter temptation David did not yet encounter.—Two lies in one breath!—[HENRY: Here David did not behave like himself; he told Ahimelech a gross untruth. . . . . . What shall we say to this? The Scripture does not conceal it, and we dare not justify it: it was ill done and proved of bad consequence (xxii. 22). It was needless for him thus to dissemble with the priest—for we may suppose that if he had told him the truth, he would have sheltered and relieved him as readily as Samuel did.—TR.]—Ver. 4 sq. SCHLIER: What right and custom required under the Old Covenant is all well, but love goes beyond this; love is the royal law, to which all other ordinances must yield, and any fulfilling of the law which forgets love commits a wrong.—Love is the royal law—all God's commandments call for nothing else than love. That which is love is worth something; but the apparently best and noblest things have no value if love is not manifested in them.—CRAMER: The love of our neighbor surpasses ceremonies (Mark ii. 27; Matt. xii. 5). [Ver. 6. Our Lord simply justifies this giving and eating the show-bread in a case of necessity as His hearers would do. If He had stopped to explain about David's falsehood, it would have interrupted His argument and thus diminished its force; and no one had a right to imagine that He approved the falsehood. We cannot be always pausing to guard against the possibility of mistake or misrepresentation, or we shall never say any thing with vigor and effect.—TR.]—Ver. 8. SCHLIER: It is not wrong if in time of need we seek weapons too, if we do not neglect human means and precautions; that too we may and ought to keep in view. But we should never place our confidence therein. Our confidence should be in the Lord alone.—Ver. 9. CRAMER: God has wonderful and manifold means of consoling a troubled man and strengthening him in the faith.—Ver. 10. S. SCHMID: If one must flee, let him so flee as to have recourse to God rather than to men.—WUERTEMBURG BIBLE: Through God's government our enemies are often compelled to do us more good than our friends. Prov. xvi. 7; Matt. ii. 13.—[Vers. 10, 11. TAYLOR: Nothing more salutary could have happened to David than such a reception as that which was given to him at Gath. When a youth is going on a wrong course, the best thing that can befall him is failure and disgrace, and the worst thing that can come to him is what the world calls success. If he succeed, the probability is that he will go farther astray than ever; but if he fail, there is hope that he will return to the right path, and seek alliance with Jehovah.—TR.]—Vers. 14, 15. STARKE: God always holds His hand over His people to protect them, and rescues them from the power of the ungodly. Ps. xxxiv. 5, 7.

J. DISSELHOFF to chapters xxi., xxii., xxvii. *Lies in the mouth of the Anointed one.* 1) Whence are lies in such a mouth? (From shaken faith in the living God and the unrest of unbelief, from seeking refuge in one's own wisdom and in the suggestions of his own heart.) 2) What delivers from such lies? (God's great mercy and His holy chastisement in the consequences of lies as being the chastenings of His righteousness, and a return to genuine repentance and to living faith.)—F. W. KRUMMACHER: *David's mad wanderings.* 1) His behaviour at Nob, 2) His flight to Gath and experiences there.

The opposite ways in which one may seek *refuge* in want and opposition: 1) The way of humble, believing obedience, in which one takes refuge in the living God, searches to know His will, and unreservedly commits himself to His guidance. 2) The way of little faith and unbelief, in which one takes refuge in flesh and blood, and in which self-will and self-wisdom are to lead to a self-determined aim.

[Chap. XXI. *Mingling of good and evil in David's behaviour.* 1) Though a brave and devout man, he falls into grievous falsehood and degrading deception, through cowardly fear and lack of trust in God.—A warning to us. Comp. Neh. xiii. 26; 1 Cor. x. 12. 2) Though so weak and erring, he remembers God's help in the past (ver. 9), cries to Him now (Ps. xxxiv. 6), rejoices in Him anew (*ib.* ver. 1), and resolves henceforth to speak truth and do good (*ib.* vers. 13, 14; comp. Ps. lvi. 13).—An encouragement to us. Comp. 1 John ii. 1.—TR.]

and the content of this Ps. agrees as much with the Hokmah-period as with David, it is to say the least, very doubtful whether David is its author.—TR.]

IV. *David's fugitive life in Judah and Moab. Saul's murder of the priests at Nob.*

CHAPTER XXII. 1–23.

1 DAVID therefore [And David] departed thence, and escaped to the cave[1] Adul-
lam; and when his brethren and all his father's house heard it, they went down
2 thither to him. And every one that was in distress, and every one that was in
debt, and every one that was discontented [embittered in soul] gathered themselves
unto him, and he became a [*om.* a] captain over them; and there were with him
3 about four hundred men. And[2] David went thence to Mizpeh[3] of Moab, and he
[*om.* he] said unto the king of Moab, Let my father and my mother, I pray thee,
4 come forth[4] *and be* with you, till I know what God will do for [to] me. And he
brought[5] them before the king of Moab, and they dwelt with him all the while that
5 David was in the hold. And the prophet Gad said unto David, Abide not in the
hold, depart and get thee into the land of Judah. Then [And] David departed
and came into the forest[6] of Hareth [Hereth].
6 When [And] Saul heard that David was discovered, and the men that were
with him; [*om.* parenthesis] now [and] Saul abode in Gibeah under a tree in
Ramah [the tamarisk-tree[7] on the height], having [and] his spear [*ins.* was] in his
7 hand, and all his servants were standing about him. Then [And] Saul said unto
his servants that stood about him, Hear now, ye Benjaminites, will the son of Jesse
give every one [all] of you fields and vineyards, *and*[8] make you all captains of
8 thousands and captains of hundreds, That all of you have conspired against me,
and there is none that showeth[9] me that my son hath made a league[10] with the son
of Jesse, and there is none of you that is sorry for me, or showeth unto me that my
son hath stirred up [set up] my servant against me to lie in wait [as a waylayer],

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. Wellhausen proposes to read מְצָדָה, "hold," on the ground of the identity of the locality with the מְצוּדָה of ver. 4. But, in addition to the uniform support which the VSS. give to the Heb. text, the same locality might be called from one feature of it a "cave," and from another a "mountain-hold."—TR.]

[2] [Ver. 3. It has been questioned whether vers. 3, 4, belonged to the original narrative, because they carry David to Moab, and say nothing of his return. But this omission is not against the habit of these ancient narratives. However, supposing this paragraph to be an insertion from another source by the editor, this does not affect the genuineness of the narrative as a whole. That David's parents are mentioned here, and not in ver. 1, or in xx. 29, accords with the circumstances; there is occasion here to mention them, there was none before. —TR.]

[3] [Ver. 3. Sept., Syr., Arab., Vulg., write this with *a* in the first syllable, which is perhaps an old pronunciation. Some Greek VSS. render σκοπίαν.—TR.]

[4] [Ver. 3. One MS. has יֵשֵׁב, "dwell" (with you), and so Sept., Syr., Arab., Vulg.; this is probably the correct reading, the יֵצֵא, "go out," not suiting the following preposition "with," and a construct. pregn. being improbable here..—TR.]

[5] [Ver. 4. Sept. takes this from stem נָחַם, and renders: "he persuaded [or appealed to] the king," which is contrary to the meaning of this verb, and against the other VSS. Wellhausen prefers the pointing וַיַּנִּחֵם (from נוּחַ), "he settled or left them with the king," as better agreeing with the following אֶת־פְּנֵי, and so read Chald., Syr., Arab., Vulg. This seems the better rendering, though after וַיַּנִּחֵם the usage would lead us to expect either simple אֵת, "with," or לִפְנֵי, "before." Possibly we have here a blending of the two prepositions.—TR.]

[6] [Ver. 5. So the VSS. except Sept., which has πόλει, "city" (עִיר instead of יַעַר), and this is approved by Lieut. Conder, of the Palestine Exploration Fund on topographical grounds. As to this we must await further explorations. —TR.]

[7] [Ver. 6. On the various and apparently arbitrary treatment of this word in the VSS. see Ges., *Thes.* s. v. The אֵשֶׁל of 1 Sam. xxxi. 3 is אֵלָה in 1 Chron. x. 12, and Gesen. suggests that the word may have come to have the general signification "tree." See Stanley's "*Sinai and Pal.*," App., § 79. There is no ground for doubting the correctness of the Heb. text here.—TR.]

[8] [Ver. 7. The לְ is strange, perhaps an Aramaism after יָשִׂים (the Chald. and Syr. have it), perhaps by error for וְ, "and."—TR.]

[9] [Ver. 8. Literally "that uncovereth my ear."—TR.]

9 as at this day? Then answered Doeg the Edomite, which [who] was set over the
servants[11] of Saul, and said, I saw the son of Jesse coming [come] to Nob to Ahi-
10 melech the son of Ahitub. And he inquired of the Lord [Jehovah][12] for him, and
gave him victuals, and gave him the sword of Goliath the Philistine.
11 Then [And] the king sent to call Ahimelech the priest the son of Ahitub, and
all his father's house, the priests that were in Nob; and they came all of them to
12 the king. And Saul said, Hear now, thou son of Ahitub. And he answered
13 [said], Here I am, my lord. And Saul said unto him, Why have ye conspired
against me, thou and the son of Jesse, in that thou hast given him bread and a
sword, and hast inquired of God for him, that he should rise against me to lie in
14 wait [as a waylayer] as at this day? Then [And] Ahimelech answered the king
and said, And who is *so* faithful among all thy servants as David [And who
among all thy servants is as David trusty], which is [*om.* which is, *ins.* and] the
king's son-in-law, and goeth at thy bidding [and hath thy private ear],[13] and is
15 honorable in thine house? Did I then begin to inquire[14] of God for him? be [Be]
it far from me; let not the king impute anything unto his servant, *nor*[15] to all the
house of my father, for thy servant knew nothing of all this, less or more [little or
16 much]. And the king said, Thou shalt surely die, Ahimelech, thou and all thy
17 father's house. And the king said unto the footmen [runners] that stood about
him, Turn and slay the priests of the Lord [Jehovah]; because their hand also is
with David, and because they knew when [that] he fled, and did not show it to
me. But the servants of the king would not put forth their hand to fall upon the
18 priests of the Lord [Jehovah]. And the king said to Doeg, Turn thou, and fall
upon the priests, and Doeg the Edomite turned, and he fell upon the priests, and
19 slew on that day fourscore and five[16] persons that did wear a linen ephod. And
Nob, the city of the priests, smote he with the edge of the sword, both men and
women, children and sucklings, and oxen and asses and sheep with the edge of the
sword.
20 And one of the sons of Ahimelech the son of Ahitub, named Abiathar, escaped,
21 and fled after David. And Abiathar showed David that Saul had slain the Lord's
22 [Jehovah's] priests. And David said unto Abiathar, I knew *it* [*om.* it] that day,
when Doeg the Edomite was there that he would surely tell Saul; I have occa-
23 sioned *the death*[17] of all the persons of thy father's house. Abide thou with me,
fear not; for he that seeketh my life seeketh thy life;[18] but [for] with me thou
shalt be [art] in safeguard.

[10] [Ver. 8. Omission of בְּרִית as in xx. 16.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 9. Sept. "mules," as in xxi. 8 (7). Or: "was standing with the servants of Saul."—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 10. One Heb. MS. and Grk., Syr., Arab., have "Elohim."—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 14. On this difficult phrase see Erdmann's exposition.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 15. The Kethib has the full form שְׁאוֹל, which before Maqqeph the Qeri reduces to the slenderer שְׁאָל.—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 15. Heb. simply בְּ, "in," before which a ו has probably fallen out.—Tr.]

[16] [Ver. 18. Heb. 85, Sept. 305, Josephus 385. Thenius suggests that Sept. 300 is for 400 represented in Heb. by ת, which was mistakenly read for ף (80), to which Wellh. objects that the final ף is not 80, but 800.—The Kethib דויג has י where Qeri דוֹאֵג has א, a not unfrequent interchange in Heb. The Syriac usage is according to the Kethib.—Tr.]

[17] [Ver. 22. Literally: "I am cause as to all the souls." On this use of סָבַב in the sense of "cause, occasion," see Ges., *Thes. s. v.* But Then. after Sept. ἐγώ εἰμι αἴτιος τῶν ψυχῶν, reads חַבְתִּי, "I am guilty;" this stem חוב occurs only once in Old Test. in Dan. i. 19 in Piel as causative; it is frequent in later Heb.—Tr.]

[18] [Ver. 23. On this reading see Erdmann's Expos.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1–5. *David a fugitive in Judah and in Moab.**—Ver. 1. His flight to the cave of *Adullam* in Judah. In the uncertainty as to this locality our best plan is to look to the city of the same name. Adullam, an ancient place (Gen. xxxviii. 1), according to Josh. xii. 15 a Canaanitish royal city, was situated (Josh. xv. 35) near Jarmuth and Socho, now Shuweikeh, under the mountains of Judah (different from the Shuweikeh [Socho] in these mountains, Josh. xv. 48) in the lowland of Judah, about sixteen miles [English] south-west of Jerusalem, and twelve miles south-east of Gath. As the present Jarmuth lies on the eastern border of the Wady Sumt, that is, on the declivity of the Judah-mountain towards Philistia, and

* [Comp. 2 Sam. xxiii. 13–17; 1 Chron. xii. 8–19.—Tr.]

as there are many caves in the neighborhood, it is a probable conjecture that one of these caves took the name Adullam from the neighboring city. Perhaps we may regard the great cave Deir Dubban near Jarmuth (Rob., *Amer. ed.*, II., 23, 51-53; Ritter, XVI., 136), as David's retreat (so *v. d.* Velde, *Reise*, II., p. 163 sq.). However, there are other caves near in the western declivity of the mountain. Tobler locates Adullam in the present village Bat-Dula, about fifteen miles southwest of Bethlehem. The great caves on the western declivity of the mountain are dry and roomy enough to hold a larger number of men than is here mentioned. Since it is expressly said that the place was in the *lowland of Judah*, the statement of Euseb. and Jerome that it was ten (twelve) miles east from Eleutheropolis, is decidedly wrong, as the cave would in that case be in the mountains (see Winer, *R.-W.*, *s. v.*). The supposition (from 2 Sam. xxiii. 13, 14) that it was near Bethlehem (Thenius) is opposed by the fact that David would then have cast himself into Saul's hands unprotected. Similarly the traditional site near the village Khureitun, five miles southeast of Bethlehem, is incompatible with the geographical and historical situation of the narrative (Rob., I., 481, 482). As the combat between David and Goliath occurred in the Terebinth-vale (in Wady Sumt) between Socho and Azekah, David, in there seeking a fit refuge from Saul and the Philistines, might see in this experience a pledge of the further protection and deliverance of the Lord's hand.*—"*Thence*," not from Nob (Then.), but from Gath, whence the place of refuge was not far.—That David's family must already have had proofs of enmity from Saul is clear from the statement that **his brethren and all his father's house** went to him in his retreat at Adullam. For Saul looked on them as sharers in David's presumed conspiracy against him, and they had therefore every reason to fear for themselves a repetition of the tragedy of Nob. See the statement in Clericus from Marcell. 23, 6, as to the procedure of oriental princes, according to which "the whole family perished for the fault of one person."—Ver. 2. But along with his family a constantly increasing number of other persons gathered around David. They are described as partly those who were *externally* in *distress*, especially through *debt*, and therefore seeking to escape their *creditors*, partly those who were *internally* discontented, *embittered* in soul. He became their *captain*, leader, so that they were not a wild and lawless rabble, but a community controlled by and obedient to *one* will. The number at present was about four hundred, but afterwards rose to six hundred (xxiii. 13).—The comparison of this body with Catiline's followers (Cler., Then.) supposes that David's retinue was of similar character with Catiline's, a riotous, adventure-seeking rabble. But there is nothing in the narrative to support such a supposition, and David's position as to them and to Saul is decidedly against it. He is far from making insurrection against Saul. His past history and his after-life up to Saul's death absolutely excludes such a view. With such a position towards Saul he could not be the "head" or "captain" of a seditious band, and with such a head these people could not be rebels and seditious. Hengstenberg (on Ps. vii. 10) rightly remarks: "David's war with Saul was one not of individuals, but of parties; the wicked espoused Saul's side, the righteous David's; comp. the much-misunderstood passage, 1 Sam. xxii. 2." The "distressed" persons were those who were persecuted by Saul's government on account of their love for David. The *debtors* were such as, under Saul's arbitrary misrule, were oppressed by their creditors, and received from the government no protection against the violation of the law of loan and interest (Ex. xxii. 25; Lev. xxv. 36; Deut. xxiii. 19). They were "bitter of soul,"* *not* as "desirous of new things," *not* as merely "dissatisfied with their present condition" (Cler.), but as those "whose anxiety of soul over the ever-worsening condition of the kingdom under Saul drove them to a leader, from whom for the future they might hope for better things" (Ew.).—Comp. Jephthah's fugitive life and retinue of "poor, empty persons," Judg. xi. 3.

Ver. 3. Without further statement concerning David's life here with his family and his band, it is next related that he went "*thence*" (answering to the "*thence*" of ver. 1) to Mizpeh of Moab. David betook himself to the king of Moab, and asked him: **Let my father and my mother come [out] to thee and abide with thee till I know what God will do to me.** It is remarkable, in the first place, that he here mentions only "father and mother;" the reason obviously is that in his present dangerous condition he could not afford these aged, helpless persons secure protection. For in this continuation of the narrative it is clearly supposed that the caves at Adullam had become an uncertain and dangerous residence through Saul's hostile attempts against David's family. His choice of Moab as refuge for his parents was probably based on the relations of his great-grandmother, the Moabitess *Ruth*, to this country. Whether the "come forth" refers to Bethlehem or Adullam as point of departure is uncertain; in any case the road to Mizpeh of Moab passed through Bethlehem, because this was the shortest way; for this "*Mizpeh of Moab*," which is to be taken as a proper name, undoubtedly lay not in the Moabitish territory proper south of the Arnon, but far north of it, "probably a city above the '*araboth of Moab*' (Num. xxii. 1; Deut. xxxiv. 1, 8; Josh. xiii. 32) opposite Jericho, whither by way of Bethlehem and the Dead Sea one might come in little time" (Then.), perhaps on the mount Abarim or Pisgah (Deut. xxxiv. 1). Saul had also to wage war with the Moabites (xiv. 47); at this time, therefore, the latter had possession of the southern portion of the transjordanic territory of the Israelites. From David's taking his parents to the king of Moab, it is probable that there was now no war between the latter and Saul. The pregnant construction

* [On Adullam see Smith's *Bib.-Dict.*; Stanley's *Lectures*, II., 69; Thomson, *Land and Book*, II., 424-427. The latter decides for Khureitun, and gives a vivid description of its labyrinthine intricacies and its strength.—Tr.]

* ["The same phrase is used of Hannah, i. 10; of David and his companions, 2 Sam. xvii. 8; and of David's followers, 1 Sam. xxx. 6. Hence the phrase here denotes those who are exasperated by Saul's tyranny" (*Bib.-Com.*) It is not necessary to suppose in all these men a theocratic feeling or love for David.—Tr.]

of the verb "come forth," followed by the Prep. "with," is not to be rejected as unsuitable, but to be retained as example of the frequent connection of a verb of motion with a predicate of rest. The renderings of the Sept. "let them be with thee," and the Vulg. "let them remain," are explanations, not signs of a different original text.*—Ver. 4. Bunsen, after Jerome, renders: "left them in the presence of the king" (וַיַּנְחֵם), against which Thenius remarks that "no change in the vocalization to avoid harshness is required," and refers to Ew., § 217, 1.—In regard to the length of his parents' stay with the king of Moab, David says (ver. 3): "till I know what God will do to me," appropriately using to the king the divine name *Elohim*.† According to this David did not remain with his parents, but went back to his life of motion and danger. Whither? The narrator says afterwards (ver. 4) that the parents remained in Moab "all the while that David was in the mountain-fastness or hold." But this fastness "on which David intrenched himself" (Bunsen) is not a height near the cave of Adullam (Bunsen); still less is it the *retreat* in the cave (Stähelin, Then.), or elsewhere in the wilderness; but, as David had to carry his parents to Moab for safety, we shall be justified in supposing that he had to find temporary shelter also for himself and his band in Moab. The refuge which he here found was no other than that Mizpeh‡ of Moab; Mizpeh signifies "watch-place, mountain-height;" here David made himself a strong position, which became a mountain-fastness (מְצוּדָה). For this meaning see Job xxxix. 38. Here he would await *what the Lord would further do to him*. The danger threatening his parents was the Lord's factual hint to him to go where it would be safer not only for them, but also for him. To these humble, trustful words corresponds the further statement that God gave him directions concerning his further way through the prophet *Gad*. Through this prophet he is commanded (ver. 5) to go into the land of *Judah;* whence it clearly appears that he was now not in that land, in which, however, Adullam lay, and therefore he could be only in the land of *Moab*. "The prophet *Gad*" is undoubtedly the same who is called "David's seer" in 1 Chron. xxi. 9, announces to him God's punishment for his sin in numbering the people, 2 Sam. xxiv. 11 sq., and according to 1 Chron. xxix. 29, wrote down David's acts. How Gad came into connection with David, is never said. Probably David's intimate relation and here presupposed acquaintance with him date from the former's close connection with Samuel's prophetic communities. It is not clear whether Gad had gone to him at the cave of Adullam, or now came for the first time to him in Moab. It is equally uncertain whether he remained with him permanently from now on. In short, Gad's sudden entrance on the scene in Moab suggests many unanswerable questions, which Stähelin excellently states: "How came he among such people? Was he always with David? Was he consulted by David as Samuel by Saul, 1 Sam. ix.? Was Gad connected with Samuel, or not?" We cannot suppose that the expression "*and Gad said*" refers to a message which he sent to David (Then.). The answer to the question "why David was not to stay in the hold, but go to Judah," is not that "he ought not to have fled anew to a foreign nation, as before to the Philistines, to the displeasure of God" (Brenz., S. Schmid, Keil); for it does not appear that his stay in Philistia was in itself displeasing to God; and if his journey to Moab had been displeasing to God, he might have been restrained therefrom beforehand by divine direction. The reason for this prophetic direction is rather to be found in the circumstances; according to xxiii. 1 the Philistines were now making plundering incursions into the south of Judah, help and protection against them was needed, and this David with his valiant band could give. He was commanded to go into Judah and free it from its enemies, and thus fulfil part of the theocratic calling, in respect to which the distracted, arbitrary rule of Saul was now impotent. Of this new divine direction in David's life Grotius well remarks: "God shows great care for David, instructing him now by prophets, now by Urim and Thummim." Proceeding on the supposition that David goes from the king of Moab to the cave of Adullam, Thenius, in order to account for the prophetic direction to go into the land of *Judah*, where also the *city* Adullam was situated, is obliged to say that probably the *cave* of Adullam was in Benjamin on the border, and, as his retreat might thus, being near Gibeah, easily be betrayed to Saul, Gad advised him to go to Judah. This explanation stands and falls with its unfounded geographical basis, which also O. v. Gerlach adopts.—By this direction to go to Judah for the above end, the prophet Gad gave David, in divine commission, instructions as to his further course; in this interval of suffering and trial between his call to be king and his actual entrance on the duties of the office, he was to be not only passive but also active, serving his people and his God against the enemies of the theocracy.—**He went into the forest of Hereth**—an unknown region, probably according to xxiii. 1 in the western part of Judah. [Sept. and Josephus have "city of Hereth (Sarik)." Lieut. Conder, of the Palestine Exploration Fund, says (Dec., 1874) that there are now no trees in this district, and argues from the geological conditions that there never could have been. He is disposed to adopt the Sept. reading "city," and to identify Hereth with a site called Kharas (near Keilah), which name is substantially identical with Hereth.—Tr.]

Vers. 6–23. *Saul's savage vengeance on Nob.* While David goes the way shown him by God's prophet the terrible consequences of his self-willed conduct at Nob, which did not accord with the Lord's will, are accomplished.

Vers. 6–10. In a formal council, in which Saul expresses his suspicion in relation to a conspiracy made against him by David and his son, Doeg betrays the proceeding of Ahimelech towards David.—Ver. 6. It is first stated that the abode of David and his men was known at Saul's court, and that Saul received information of his servants'

* [On this reading see "Text. and Gramm."—Tr.]

† [As distinguished from Jehovah. Yet that the name Jehovah was not unknown in Moab is made probable by its occurrence on the Inscription of Mesha, dating about one hundred and fifty years after this time.—Tr.]

‡ [Syr. here has Mispeh. Wordsworth (on ver. 4) strangely derives מְצוּדָה from צוּר, "rock."—Tr.]

acquaintance with this circumstance. It is this fact, that Saul *heard, received information* of their knowledge of David's position, that is the ground of his charging them (ver. 7) with complicity in the supposed conspiracy of David and Jonathan. In ver. 6 the words: "And Saul heard . . . . with him" belong syntactically and logically to ver. 7, and the rest of ver. 6 forms a parenthesis [so Eng. A. V., but it is better to preserve in the translation the simple, direct form of the Hebrew.—Tr.]. **And Saul abode in Gibeah** (not, as Sept., "on the hill") **under the tamarisk,**—the Article indicates that this place was the appointed and usual one for such councils. **On the height** (not with Luther [and Eng. A. V.] "in Ramah") points out the elevated situation, in keeping with the solemnity of the occasion, as it is hereafter described.—**His spear in his hand,**—the spear, as well as the sceptre, was the symbol of royal power. **All his servants** stood about him, it was, therefore, a full assembly of the whole personnel of the Court. Bunsen: "He held a formal court, surrounded by all the magnates (chiefly Benjaminites) of his kingdom."–Ver. 7. The address: **Hear, ye Benjaminites,** is in keeping with the importance of the solemn scene (so vividly sketched in a few strokes) as a sort of judicial assembly [*Bib. Com.* Parliament.—Tr.], and at the same time has a particularistic-partisan tone, as Saul was himself of the tribe of Benjamin. Saul's question: **Will the son of Jesse give you all fields and vineyards? make you all captains of hundreds and captains of thousands?** is noteworthily and characteristically prefixed to the words which express his complaint and suspicion of the courtiers, on which only a question so spiteful and so tinged with venomous savagery could be based. In thus putting things hindmost first and upside down, Saul again exhibits himself as a man, who, through burning hatred to David and blind suspicion, has lost his mental control.—**Also to you** [Heb. literally: "also to you all will the son of Jesse give?" *etc.*—Tr.]; the Heb. text is to be maintained against the groundless change proposed by Thenius "in truth will the son," *etc.* (הָאֻמְנָם after the merely elucidatory Sept. and Vulg.). This phrase does not mean "to you all also, besides the others to whom he has already given," since it is nowhere said of David that he provided for his adherents, nor was he in condition to do so. According to the rule that the Heb. particle [גַּם] expresses reciprocal relation, the thought here is: "will David also by gifts show himself so grateful to you all for your making common cause with him against me?" The word (as here) is toneless [with maqqeph.—Tr.] in questions, to indicate reciprocity.* Saul imagines that his courtiers all secretly hold with David, hence his question: "will he also give you all?"="will he then give?" *etc.* In Saul's words there is the latent sense: Will he, of another tribe, reward you, as *I* have done to *you*, my fellow-tribesmen? Will he not rather favor his tribesmen, the men of Judah? Will it not be to your interest to stand on my side? Seb. Schmid: "Ye have received the greatest benefits from me, such as ye could not expect from him, and yet ye are more attached to him than to me." These words give us an insight into Saul's partisan and particularistic mode of governing, in which he preferably filled court-offices with persons of his own tribe. From landed possessions (fields and vineyards), Saul goes on to refer to places of honor in the now organized army. The לְ before the second "all of you" is not to be exchanged for "and" (so Then. [and Eng. A. V.] after Sept. and Vulg., which indeed give the sense correctly), but is to be taken either in the sense of "as regards"—"will he (also) as regards you all make captains?" *etc.*, that is, take account of you all in filling these offices (Ew., § 310 *a*), or, in the distributive sense, which it sometimes has (Ew., § 217 *a*, § 277 *e*)="will he make all and each of you" (Ewald)? The sense is given correctly by Maurer: "Will he make as many tribunes and centurions as may be necessary in order that each of you may have such an office?"—Ver. 8. In his mental derangement and passionate excitement Saul takes it as certain *that they have all conspired against him:* because, as he says, they told him nothing of the covenant which his son had made with David against him. These words pre-suppose that he had learned something of the occurrence related in **xx.** 12–17 [the covenant between David and Jonathan], for they are too definite [made (Heb. cut) a covenant] to refer merely to the friendship of Jonathan and David. He assumes that his court-officials knew of this covenant, and then concludes that they had conspired against him with these two men. The words: "there is none that is sorry for me," express the opinion that they had abandoned him in their hearts. His charge passes to the factually false assertion that his son had set his servant (David) as a lier in-wait against him. (Sept. "enemy"=לְאֹיֵב, without ground, Vulg. appropriately *insidiantem mihi.*) There is herein a two-fold false accusation: 1) as to David, that he was lying in wait to take his throne and life; and 2) as to Jonathan, that he was the cause of this insurrectionary and insidious conduct of David. Saul fancies himself in the meshes of a conspiracy against his person and kingdom organized by his own son, and accuses his courtiers of knowledge thereof and active participation therein. To such a pitch had the darkening and wasting of his inner life grown through hate and suspicion.—**As is now evident** [=as it is this day], comp. Deut. viii. 18. In proof Saul points to David's concealment and retinue. He was, therefore, not without information concerning this fact. S. Schmid: "as is proved by this day, in which David gathers an army, and from the forest lays snares for me."—Ver. 9. Here we must especially note in the psychological point of view, how Doeg's information about David's visit to Ahimelech and the latter's inquiring of the Lord for him and providing him with food and the sword of Goliath (comp. xxi. 8), turns Saul's dark thoughts away from the

* [This rule (Ew., § 352) hardly applies here; גַּם—"together" (Ps. cxxxiii. 1), and can express reciprocity only when the connection affirms something to be true of two or more persons; here it would apply to the courtiers only, excluding David. It is better to take it as qualifying the whole sentence,—"yet" (Ew., § 354 *a*), or as qualifying "son of Jesse," as it may do, though it stands at the beginning of the sentence.—Tr.]

courtiers, and directs all his energy to the person of the high-priest, so that he now thinks only of taking vengeance on him. Doeg is said to be "set over (or, standing with) Saul's servants;" why the version of the Sept.: "set over the mules" (פִּרְדֵי), should be the "only appropriate one" [Then.], it is hard to see. The rendering of the Heb.: **set over the servants of Saul** (Chald., Kimchi, Vulg., Syr.)="highest court-official, court-marshal, minister of the household," does not agree with the description in xxi. 7: "overseer of the herdsmen" (as was natural in this first stage of the development of the kingdom, and in accordance with the position of his family, Saul's possessions consisted chiefly in herds). Rather the words answer to the statement (ver. 7): "all his servants stood by (around) him," and are to be rendered: **And** (or, also) **he stood with the servants of Saul** (Arab., De Wette, Buns. [Philipps.]). "As chief overseer of the herds Doeg was in a sort one of the dignitaries of the kingdom" (Bunsen). There is no superfluous statement here; the narrator declares that he was *now here* present, having in xxi. 8 (7) described him as being in the sanctuary at Nob. From the connection it is clear that Doeg gave his information with evil purpose, in order to turn the king's suspicion from the courtiers to the high-priest. In Saul's frame of mind the mere statement of actual fact, of which he was ear and eye-witness, had all the more powerful effect on him. S. Schmid: "Far better, therefore, did Saul's other servants, who kept silence." Hengstenberg (*Introd. to Ps. lii.*) absolves Doeg from enmity to David, observing that he merely stated the fact, to which the malicious interpretation was given by Saul alone; but this does not agree with what Saul had just before said against David and his courtiers, nor with Doeg's bloody proceeding against the priests at Nob, nor with what is said in Ps. lii. 3-5 of the tongue like a sharp razor, of the wickedness, falsehood, calumny and deceit of the enemy, all of which applies to Doeg, but not to Saul. Rightly Grotius: "see the description of Doeg in Ps. lii." That Ahimelech inquired of the Lord for David is here by Doeg's assertion added to the account in xxi. 7-10 [6-9], and confirmed by Ahimelech himself, ver. 15.*—Ver. 11. On this treacherous and slanderous statement of Doeg, Saul straightway sends for **Ahimelech and all his father's house, that is, all the priests in Nob**, "because these all belonged to the one family of Aaron" (Then.). In Nob, therefore, dwelt the whole priestly family with the high-priest.—Ver. 12 sq. The council now becomes a solemn tribunal with pleading and verdict.—Saul assumes that Ahimelech is guilty, adducing the three facts mentioned as in themselves proofs of guilt.—Ver. 14 sq. The high-priest's *answer* has the stamp of quiet, clearness and a good conscience. First, he affirms that he was justified in unsuspiciously trusting to David. "And who among all thy servants is as David *trusted*" (De Wette)? that is object of confidence; in proof of which he refers to three things: David's position at court as the king's son-in-law, as his trusted privy-councillor and as an honored man in his house. The word מִשְׁמַעְתּ [Eng. A. V. "bidding"]="*audience;*" so in Isa. xi. 14, as Böttcher has shown, "they are *their* (Israel's) *audience,*" that is, "they are of those who seek audience of Israel, pay court to Israel, come with homage," *not* "who obey them" [as in Eng. A. V., and so J. A. Alexander.—Tr.]—The word has the same signification also in 2 Sam. xxiii. 23 and 1 Chron. xi. 25, where it is said: "And David set Benaiah for his audience" [Eng. A. V.: "over his guard"], appointed him privy councillor.—[In 1 Chronicles xi. 25 the Preposition is עַל, "over," in 2 Samuel it is אֶל, "to."—Tr.]—סור="to withdraw, turn aside," for a definite purpose, for example, to see (Ex. iii. 3; Ruth iv. 1), here "withdrawing to thy audience" [Eng. A. V. "goeth"], as "having interior admission" (Böttch.); so Maurer: "who turns aside (from the other courtiers) that he may hear thee, that is, who has access to the interior of thy palace, and there takes part in thy more weighty counsels." Schultz: "Leaving all else, listening to thee and doing thy will." This explanation is here confirmed by the phrase "*among* all thy servants" (Böttch.). Thenius takes the word as = "*obedience*" in the special sense, as meaning the devotedly obedient *body-guard* (so also Ewald and Bertheau on 1 Chron. xi. 25) and renders "captain over the body-guard" (reading עַל for אֶל and, after Sept. and Chald., שַׂר for סָר). Against this Böttcher rightly remarks that the traces [of a different reading] in the versions are altogether uncertain, that Thenius' reading is not Heb. (עַל is found with שַׂר, instead of the Gen., only where it is dependent on a verb), that according to 1 Sam. xviii. 5, 13, David had command not of the body-guard, but of other more distant troops, that, as the other designation of David in the verse (even "son-in-law") are moral marks of confidence, the mention of a military position would be strange, and the very question "Who is among thy servants captain over thy body-guard *as* David?" would sound somewhat queerly.*—Ahimelech says, therefore, that he could have done nothing less than in good conscience trust a man so trusted and honored by the king, "as a faithful subject of the king" (Keil) giving David *bread* and *arms* on his assertion that he had a secret commission from the king.—Further, in the question: **Did I that day begin to inquire of God for him?** he insists on the fact that David had often before received from him in the sanctuary divine direction in important undertakings. [This interpretation is denied by some (so *Bib.-Com.*) on the ground that nothing is said in ch. xxi. of such an inquiry by Ahimelech for David. The Midrash also says that counsel was given by Urim and Thummim only to the king or his public ambassador (Philipps.); but Rashi agrees with the common interpretation, and Abarbanel gives both that and the direct form "that was the first day that I inquired of God

* [This is not certain. See on ver. 15.—Tr.]

* [The passage 1 Chr. xi. 25, nevertheless, makes a difficulty and the differences of the vss. suggest a corruption of the text. Here the rendering of Böttcher and Erdmann (and Philippson and *Bib. Com.*) seems the best, though we can hardly sever this passage from 1 Chr. xi. 25.—Tr.]

for him, and I did not know that it was displeasing to thee." Some, taking the phrase הֵחֵל לִשְׁאוֹל to mean simply "to inquire," find a negative sense in the question: "did I inquire? Nay, I did not." But this weakening of הֵחֵל is not justified by usage; the idea of "beginning" must be expressed here. This being so, the choice is between the two interpretations above given, the interrogatory and the direct, and of these the former (that of Erdmann) seems more in keeping with Ahimelech's dignity of character. The omission of the fact in chap. xxi. must then be attributed to the curtness of the narrative. Yet this omission is surprising, and, while Ahimelech's somewhat obscure words here scarcely admit of any other satisfactory translation than that given by Erdmann, there is room for doubt as to his meaning.—Tr.].—On this statement of facts Ahimelech founds his *affirmation:* **Far be it from me**, that is, such a crime as he is accused of, that he was party to a conspiracy against the king.—In respect to this accusation, his defence culminates in the request: **Let not the king impute anything to his servant, to the whole house of my father**, wherein the absence of the copula ["nor," supplied in Eng. A. V.] is to be referred with Keil to the excitement of the speaker. Finally he adds as *reason:* **For thy servant knows nothing of all this, little or great**, that is, nothing at all. The "all this" refers not to what David had told him, as if he intended to say that he knew nothing of David's false assertion, but to what Saul had charged him with.—This answer of the high-priest supposes certainly that he knew nothing of the unhappy condition of things in respect to David, or of his flight with its causes and circumstances.—Ver. 16. Saul's arbitrary, precipitate judgment as contrasted with the innocence of the high-priest and of the whole body of priests.—Ver. 17. *The order for its immediate execution* is given to the "runners," who were either servants for running on messages, or guards who ran before or beside the king in his public appearance, [Eng. A. V., "footmen"]. Comp. ix. 11; 2 Ki. x. 25. As court-officials they stood also in this solemn assembly by the king. For the expression "stood by or about," see vers. 6, 9 [on ver. 9 see the Exposition.—Tr.]. According to Saul's decision not only the high-priest, but also the whole priesthood should die for alleged participation in David's conspiracy. **For their hand also is with David**, they make common cause with him against me. This assertion he bases on the unproved fact: **they knew that he fled, and did not show it me.** (Instead of Kethib "his ear" read with Qeri "my ear," for such a sudden transition to indirect discourse "and (as he said) did not show him," is impossible).—The guards refuse to obey Saul's order, a proof of the disorder which his blind rage produced. This refusal reminds us of the scene in xiv. 45, where Saul's sentence of death against Jonathan is opposed. Saul's servants will not lay their hands on the sacred persons of the priests; this is indicated in the expression "the priests of *the Lord*." [Wordsworth: Thus they were more faithful to Saul than if they had obeyed his order, which was against the commandment of the Lord. Theodoret (in Wordsw.): The heinousness of Saul's sin is made more conspicuous by his servants' refusal.—Tr.].—Ver. 18. Saul's choice of Doeg as the executor of his order is a proof of the savageness which was combined with wickedness and guile in this Edomite. On the form of his name "Doyeg" (as in ver. 22) see Ew. § 45 *d*. The pron. "he" ["he fell"] emphasizes Doeg's willingness in contrast with the refusal of the guards. As above by the expression "priests of the Lord," so here the wickedness of this act is brought prominently out by the significant reference to the official dress of the priests, "who wore a linen ephod," the sign of the holiness of their persons. On the wearing of the ephod see ch. ii. 18. **Linen**; the common priests, therefore, wore a linen over-garment similar in form to the high-priestly cape or ephod (Buns.).—Ver. 19. Nob is here expressly called the "city of the priests." The whole city, as such, with all living things therein, is devoted to destruction by Saul in his fury. It is treated by him as a city under the ban (Cherem), which is polluted by idolatry and therefore devoted to destruction. The wrong alleged to be done to him by the priests is laid on the whole city as an idolatrous wrong against the Lord Himself, which is therefore thus to be avenged. Comp. Deut. xiii. 13 sq. [Saul does not seem to have had the theocratic cherem or ban in mind, but in an access of rage did what was not uncommon among ancient oriental princes.—Tr.].—Ver. 20. Only one son of Ahimelech, Abiathar, escaped the slaughter. *How* that happened is not said. Perhaps he was not present at this trial, and hastened away from Nob while it was being destroyed. "*After David*," that is, to the retreat of the fugitive David. This is another proof of the intimate relations between David and the high-priestly family.—Vers. 21–23. *Through Abiathar David received information* of Saul's bloody vengeance on Nob. David said to Abiathar: "I knew that day (comp. chap. xxi. 7, 8) that, because Doeg the Edomite was there, he would certainly tell Saul." So Vulg. and Then.; *not* (Keil): "I knew that day *that* Doeg . . . *that* he," *etc.*, *nor* (De Wette): "I knew . . . *that* Doeg . . . *and that*." David confesses himself guilty of the blood shed in Nob, because his flight thither and conduct there, while he knew of Doeg's presence, gave occasion to it. Vulg.: "I am guilty of all the souls." This confession of David shows the strictness of his self-judgment. (סָבַב here = "to be guilty of a thing," see Ges. *Lex.* *s. v.* In the Talmud סִבָּה = "cause").—Ver. 23. The consequence of David's invitation to Abiathar *to abide with him* is that the high-priesthood goes over to David and to the new future kingdom, though David entered into no rebellion against Saul for this end. **Fear not,**—namely, Saul's snares and power. **For he that seeketh my life,** *etc.*—Certainly the converse assertion would be natural here: "He that seeks thy life seeks mine;" but we are not therefore with Then. (after the Sept., whose translation seeks to get rid of this difficulty) to change the text, so that it would read: "for whatever place I seek for myself, that will I (also) seek for thee," but we must explain it from the reference that David therein has to Saul. As against Saul Da-

vid binds the fate of the fugitive high-priest to his own in an indissoluble covenant under the protection of God. The sense is: "The persecution which I suffer, touches thee also. But I stand under God's protection as one that suffers injustice; so art thou, because thy life like mine is threatened, *safely kept* in company with me." The second "*for*" [Eng. A. V. "but" כִּי] is also dependent on the "fear not." This consolatory assurance is based first, on the reference to their common enemy, and on the reference to the protection which Abiathar will enjoy with him, who knew that, as regarded Saul, he was under God's special protection, מִשְׁמֶרֶת "preservation" (Ex. xii. 6; xvi. 33 sq.), abstract for concrete, "a precious deposit or trust" (Ewald).

[During this first period of David's life as outlaw several incidents occurred which are not mentioned in this narrative. We learn from 2 Sam. xxiii. 13 that three of his chief heroes came to him in the cave of Adullam, one of whom was his nephew Abishai, afterwards a famous general. A little after (1 Chr. xi. 15–19) occurred that noble act of loving daring, when the "three mightiest" broke through the Philistine army and brought their leader water from the well of Bethlehem, for which he longed. This was while he was in the "hold;" and at this time apparently came to him the stout band of lion-faced, gazelle-footed Gadites, who swam the Jordan when its banks were overflowed, and scattered all enemies before them (1 Chr. xii. 8–15), and an enthusiastic body of men of Judah and Benjamin, for whose friendship Amasai answered in his passionate speech (1 Chr. xii. 16–18). As to whether David was at Keilah when Abiathar came to him, see Erdmann on 1 Sam. xxiii. 6. For fuller accounts of this period see Chandler (ch. vii.) and Stanley's Lectures, xxii.—Tr.]

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. Whether *Psalm lvii.*, whose title is: "By David, when he fled from Saul in the cave," refers to the case of Adullam or to Engedi (1 Sam. xxiv.) is uncertain. Certainly, however, the situation here, the condition of his inner life as fugitive, and his experience of divine help, form *the basis of the thought of the Psalm,* in which first "*believing hope* (founded on *experience*) of speedy and sure *divine help* out of great *peril of life* from violent men, shows itself in the *prayer for a new* manifestation of divine *grace,* whereby God's *truth* and trustworthiness will be shown by deeds," and then, "after a short description of the *snares,* which resulted in the destruction of the enemies themselves, the certain assurance of victory is expressed in the invocation of the author's own soul to praise God in all the world on the ground of His self-revelation in His glory" (Moll).—*Psalm lii.* certainly in its essential content agrees with David's position as indicated by the reference in the title to Doeg's treachery. But, from the general nature of the didactic content of the Psalm, we must also suppose a reference to the hate and persecution of Saul, whose tool Doeg was.

2. *David* is the representative of the theocratic principle, for which he suffers and endures. The uninterrupted tribulation which he experiences from now till he enters into the theocratic kingly office, he bears for the sake of the Lord, who has chosen him for this office and the calling therewith conjoined for all Israel; it serves to humble and purify him, and its precious fruit is that he yields himself more absolutely into God's hands, and treads solely the path which the divine providence points out; he will know only what God will do for him; he listens only to what God says, and obeys unconditionally God's command announced by the mouth of the prophet. So, in the development of his inner and outer life under the many testing and purifying sufferings sent by God, David becomes more and more a shining type of the humble faith, which bows unmurmuringly under the Lord's afflicting hand, accepts unconditionally God's hidden providences, is attentive to the Lord's word, and yields joyful obedience to His commands.—*Saul* has become the representative of the antitheocratic principle; conscious that the kingdom is justly taken from him for his self-willed apostasy from God, he suffers pain and anguish in the fear of losing the throne through David, and, his look distorted by this inner unrest, sees everywhere only conspiracy and treachery against his throne and life; the more he shuts his eyes to the divine leadings in David's life, and obstinately withstands God's known will concerning David, the more does he harden his heart against God's word and instructions, the deeper does he sink into the abyss of wretched fear of man, and the farther from his heart recedes true fear of God, the more irretardably rushes on his inner life, pursued by the terrors of the angry God, and of a conscience pressed down by the burden of unforgiven sin, which yet leads him not to pure self-knowledge and humble subjection to God's almighty hand, towards the abyss of doubt and the judgment of inner hardening of heart.

3. While apparently under Saul's sharply-sketched despotic and cruel rule (a horrible caricature of the theocratic government) the three pillars of God's kingdom in Israel break down—the theocratic kingdom in David hunted to the death, prophets oppressed and silenced, the priesthood exterminated—yet just here this *threefold office* appears in most significant facts under the protection of the almighty, faithful God, who will not let His covenant fail, as *factual divine promise* or prediction: about *David,* as the Lord's chosen king, is grouped His family as representatives of Israel's hope of salvation, and is gathered the root of the theocratic congregation, in *Gad* appears prophecy in God's name, and with the light of His word pointing the way out of the gloom, and in *Abiathar* the high-priesthood is rescued from Saul's purposed destruction into the safe-keeping of the future king.

[4. It is hardly necessary now to discuss the question, whether David was a rebel against Saul. As he never lifted his hand against his king, as he always cherished love for him, as his military enterprises were all against the enemies of Israel, as his efforts were confined to the saving of his life from Saul's attempts, it is clear that he was not a traitor and a rebel. He was an outlaw, but a patriotic, God-fearing, loyal outlaw. See Chandler's elaborate defence of David against Bayle in chs. vii. and viii. of his "Life of David."—Tr.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1. S. SCHMID: When God has rescued us from danger, we should make such a use of it as to grow wiser thereby.—OSIANDER: It makes our cross much heavier to see that evil comes upon our dearest friends and kindred for our sake.—Ver. 2. BERL. BIBLE: Though thou findest thyself without refuge, yet thou becomest a refuge for all the distressed.—All who find themselves in distress are even in the midst of their pains filled with joy, when they meet with other men who have to bear the same oppressions. This at once forms a very close union among them.—[Ver. 4. Descendants of Ruth compelled by civil strife to leave Jehovah's country, and seek shelter in Moab.—TR.]

Vers. 6–10. SCHLIER (Saul): Saul is filled with fear of men, because he lacks true fear of God.—O how much fear and anxiety there is, and so often it has no other ground than in an evil conscience; how much fear of man there is, and the fountain is in sins unforgiven; how much despondency there is, and yet all might be so far otherwise if people would only humble themselves and confess their sins.—Ver. 8. STARKE: That is the way with the ungodly, that with their evil behaviour they yet want to have their rights.—BERL. BIBLE: Perturbation and distrust are constantly the companions of malevolence and sin, while tranquillity stands by the side of persecuted innocence.—[Ver. 9. A ruler who wants informers can always find them.—TR.]

Vers. 11–15. SCHLIER (Saul): O how unkingly stands King Saul before us, how dignified, how truly kingly stands Ahimelech! So true is it that he that ruleth his spirit is better than he that taketh a city!—It is manliness to place the truth above everything, and go security for the truth, and defend the truth, even unto death. Let us learn from this royal manliness of an Ahimelech, who also confessed the truth even unto death.—[Ver. 13. It is so easy for the passionate to cheat themselves with hasty inferences.—TR.]—Ver. 16 sq. Doeg and Saul were also men like ourselves, both had also a conscience, both were also yielding and receptive, and Saul was once even in good ways, he had learned to fear and love God, and yet both were now so deep-sunken, both were now hardened, and to human eyes irrecoverably lost. The reason is, they trifled with God's word, they were not willing to obey the truth, they wilfully lived on in their sins.—No man is sure that he will not fall into sin, nor is any man sure that he will remain in a good way; it holds good for all that they must always work out their salvation with fear and trembling.—[Ver. 17. The best friends of an angry man are those who refuse to aid him in doing wrong.—Vers. 16–19. HENRY: See the desperate wickedness of Saul, when the Spirit of the Lord was departed from him. Nothing so vile but they may be hurried to it, who have provoked God to give them up to their heart's lusts. He that was so compassionate as to spare Agag and the cattle of the Amalekites, in disobedience to the command of God, could now, with unrelenting bowels, see the priests of the Lord murdered, and nothing spared of all that belonged to them. For that sin, God left him to this.—There are many historical cases in which sentimental humanity has become transformed into savage cruelty.—Ver. 18. So often in what calls itself the administration of *justice*, many innocent men are punished because the one man who did the wrong has escaped.—God makes the wrath of man to praise Him (Ps. lxxvi. 10). The punishment foretold against the house of Eli (ch. ii. 31) is executed through the madness of Saul and the baseness of Doeg.—HALL: It was just in God, which in Doeg was most unjust. Saul's cruelty, and the treachery of Doeg, do not lose one dram of their guilt by the counsel of God, neither doth the holy counsel of God gather any blemish by their wickedness. . . . If Saul and Doeg be instead of a pestilence or fever, who can cavil?—Ver. 19. A madly passionate man in authority (despot, parent, teacher) often seeks to justify his cruel conduct by still greater cruelty.—TR.]

[Ver. 22. TAYLOR: Behold how impossible it is to arrest the consequences of our evil actions. . . . I have no doubt that when David heard of all this, he would willingly have given all that he had, ay, even his hopes of one day sitting on the throne of Israel, if he could have recalled the evil which he had spoken, and undone its dismal consequences. But it was impossible. The lie had gone forth from him; and having done so, it was no longer under his control, but would go on producing its diabolical fruits. And so it is yet. . . . We may, indeed, repent of our sin; we may even, through the grace of God for Christ's sake, have the assurance that we are forgiven for it; but the sin itself will go on working its deadly results.—TR.]

[Ch. xxii. David struggling upward, Saul sinking downward. (Comp. Hist. and Theol., No. 2.)

[Ver. 3. *Our Future.* 1) Our future will be determined by God. Comp. Ps. xxxi. 15. 2) Our future cannot be clearly foreseen by us, and this is well. Comp. Prov. xxvii. 1. 3) We must provide as wisely as we can for our future, and then wait. 4) Whatever God may do to us in the future, we must try to receive it as from Him.

[Ver. 5. *Danger and Duty.* 1) Where no duty calls, let us keep away from danger. Comp. Gen. xiii. 12, 13; Ex. ii. 15; 1 Sam. xxiii. 13; John iv. 1; xi. 53, 54. 2) But often, to keep away from danger is to be out of the reach of success. If David had remained in Moab, he would never have become king of Israel. "Nothing venture, nothing have." Comp. Matt. xvi. 25; Acts xxi. 13; John xii. 23. 3) How can we tell when duty calls us into danger? Not now by special revelation, but by keeping our minds familiar with the written word, watching the leadings of Providence, seeking counsel from the wise and good, striving to judge calmly even amid perturbations, and praying all the while for the guidance of God's Spirit. Comp. 1 Chron. xxviii. 9; Prov. iii. 6.

[Ver. 17. Three scenes in the life of Saul, xi. 13; xv. 22, 23; xxii. 16–19.

[Vers. 6–23. *Pictures of Human Nature.* 1) A man in authority, whose misfortunes, though due to his own fault, make him suspicious (ver.

3) and cruelly unjust (ver. 16). 2) A basely ambitious man who seeks to build himself up by ruining others (vers. 9, 10, 18, comp. Ps. lii.). 3) An innocent man accused, who defends himself both with forcible argument (ver. 14) and with dignified denial (ver. 15). 4) A good, but erring man who mournfully sees that his sin has brought destruction on his friends (ver. 22).—Tr.]

V. 1. *David's expedition against the Philistines for the rescue of Keilah.* 2. *His abode in the wilderness of Ziph, and the treachery of the Ziphites against him.* 3. *His deliverance from Saul in the wilderness of Maon.*

Chap. XXIII. [Eng. A. V. XXIII. 1–28].

1 Then [And] they told David, saying, Behold, the Philistines fight against Kei-
2 lah, and they rob the threshing-floors. Therefore [And] David enquired of the
Lord [Jehovah], saying, Shall I go and smite these Philistines? And the Lord
3 [Jehovah] said unto David, Go and smite the Philistines, and save Keilah. And
David's men said unto him, Behold, we be [are] afraid here in Judah; how much
more, then, if we come[1] [go] to Keilah against the armies [ranks][2] of the Philis-
4 tines? Then [And] David enquired of the Lord [Jehovah] yet again. And the
Lord [Jehovah] answered him and said, Arise, go down to Keilah, for I will de-
5 liver [give] the Philistines into thine hand. So [And] David, and [with][3] his men,
went to Keilah and fought with the Philistines, and brought away their cattle, and
smote them with a great slaughter; so [and] David saved the inhabitants of Kei-
6 lah. And it came to pass, when Abiathar the son of Ahimelech fled to David to
Keilah, that he came down with an ephod in his hand [an ephod came down in his
hand].[4]
7 And it was told Saul that David was come to Keilah. And Saul said, God hath
delivered[5] him into mine hand, for he is shut in by[6] entering into a town [city] that
8 hath gates and bars. And Saul called all the people together [summoned all the
people] to war, to go down[7] to Keilah to besiege David and his men. And David
9 knew that Saul secretly [*om.* secretly] practised[8] mischief against him, and he said
10 to Abiathar the priest, Bring hither the ephod. Then said David [And David
said], O Lord [Jehovah] God of Israel, thy servant hath certainly heard that[9] Saul
seeketh to come to Keilah to destroy the city for my sake. Will the men [citizens]

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 3. Erdmann: "and we are really to go, *etc.*?" Syr.: "how shall we go?" Sept.: "how will it be if we go?" all of which give the general sense; Eng. A. V. has the more exact rendering, and so Chald. and Vulg.—Then.: "how much less shall we go?"—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 3. Sept. σκῦλα "spoil," which Then. prefers, supposing it to represent מְשִׁסּוֹת "booty," whence the Heb. text מַעַרְכוֹת might easily come. Against this Wellhausen justly points out the unsuitableness of the resulting thought, and suggests that σκῦλα (variants σκωλα, κοιλιας) is another form of Κεϊλά, and that the Greek omits the מַעַרְכוֹת—as to the improbability of battle-lines in Philistine raiding-parties, they might well exist, or David's men may naturally exaggerate the danger.

[3] [Ver. 4. Heb.: "David and his men," but the following verbs are in the Singular, making David the subject.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 6. Erdmann: "The ephod came down to him," which, however, the Heb. does not mean from the connection. Erdmann suggests the right sense in the Exposition.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 7. נִכַּר is rendered by the VSS. "delivered," but Sept. "sold" מָכַר, adopted by Then.; Wellh. says the text seems made up of מכר and נתן. The word is literally "ignored," and so perhaps = "abandoned."—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 7. Literally. "at entering" (לָבוֹא), not "shut in (forced) to enter."—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 8. Sept. in inverse order; "to go down to war," perhaps a mere softening. The Heb. order is better; Saul summons the people generally to war, and then the special purpose is added of going down to Keilah.—Instead of צוּר some MSS. have צוּר.

[8] [Ver. 9. חָרַשׁ — "cut, work on the forge" — "practice." Eng. A. V. gets its "secretly" from Vulg. *clam*, and this is perhaps from the meaning "to be deaf, dumb," also found in this verb, but not applicable here; so Sept. rendered παρασιωπᾷ before which, however, it naturally found itself obliged to insert the negative.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 10. Thenius reads: "Saul seeks . . . to destroy the city in order that the citizens of Keilah may deliver me into his hand," on which see Erdmann. To this the objections are 1) that it supposes a construction

11 of Keilah deliver me up into his hand? will Saul come down, as thy servant hath
heard? O Lord [Jehovah] God of Israel, I beseech thee, tell thy servant. And
12 the Lord [Jehovah] said, He will come down. Then said David [And David said],
Will the men [citizens] of Keilah deliver me and my men into the hand of Saul?
And the Lord [Jehovah] said, They will deliver thee up.
13 Then [And] David and his men, which were about six[10] hundred, arose and de-
parted out of Keilah, and went whithersoever they could go. And it was told Saul
14 that David was escaped from Keilah; and he forbare to go forth. And David
abode in the wilderness in [*ins.* the] strongholds, and remained [abode] in a [the]
mountain in the wilderness of Ziph. And Saul sought him every day, but God de-
livered him not into his hand.
15 And David saw[11] that Saul was come out to seek his life. And David was in
16 the wilderness of Ziph in a [the] wood. And Jonathan, Saul's son arose, and went
17 to David into the wood, and strengthened his hand in God, And he [*om.* he] said
to him, Fear not, for the hand of Saul my father shall not find thee, and thou shalt
be king over Israel, and I shall be next unto thee; and that also Saul my father
18 knoweth [and that knoweth Saul my father also]. And they two made a covenant
before the Lord [Jehovah]. And David abode in the wood, and Jonathan went to
his house.[12]
19 Then came up the Ziphites[13] to Saul to Gibeah, saying, Doth not David hide
himself with us in [*ins.* the] strongholds in the wood, in the hill of Hachilah,[14] which
20 is on the south of Jeshimon [the desert]? Now, therefore, O king, come down ac-
cording to all the desire of thy soul to come down, and our part shall be to deliver
21 him into the king's hand. And Saul said, Blessed be ye of the Lord [Jehovah],
22 for ye have compassion on me. Go, I pray you, prepare yet [be yet heedful],[15] and
know and see his place where his haunt [foot] is, *and* [*om.* and] who hath seen[16]
23 him there; for it is told me that he dealeth very subtilly. See therefore, [And see],
and take knowledge of all the lurking places where he hideth himself, and come ye
again to me with the certainty, and I will go with you; and it shall come to pass,
if he be in the land, that I will search him out throughout [among] all the thou-
24 sands of Judah. And they arose and went to Ziph before Saul; but [and] David
and his men were in the wilderness of Maon, in the plain on the south of Jeshimon
25 [the desert]. Saul also [And Saul] and his men went to seek *him.*[17] And they
told [it was told] David, wherefore [and] he came down into a [to the] rock [cliff]
26 and abode in the wilderness of Maon. And Saul[18] went on the side of the moun-
tain; and David made haste to get away for fear of Saul, for [and] Saul and his
27 men compassed David and his men round about to take them, But [And] there
came a messenger unto Saul, saying, Haste thee and come, for the Philistines have
28 invaded the land. Wherefore [And] Saul returned from pursuing after Da-
vid, and went against [to meet] the Philistines. Therefore they called that place
Sela hammahlekoth.[19]

(Inf. with suffix followed by Accus.-subject) doubtful in Heb. (Wellh.), and 2) Saul's purpose in destroying the city, namely, that the *citizens* may deliver David up, seems a strange one. On the other hand the omission of the first clause of ver. 11 (Wellh.) is a violent procedure, like that of Syr., which omits the whole of this verse. The procedure of the vers. shows the difficulty they had with the text, but also seems to vouch for its integrity. It is perhaps better to attribute the repetition to excitement, or to regard the first question as a general one, which is afterwards for the sake of clearness, divided into two.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 13. Sept. four hundred by error from xxii. 2.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 15. Ewald and Wellhausen emend to וַיִּרָא "feared" on the ground that this is required in order to connect with the preceding context and to explain the words of Jonathan in ver. 17. Yet the connection is so general a one that such a change seems unnecessary.—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 18. Some MSS. have דַּרְכּוֹ "his way," but the text is best supported.—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 19. The Heb. has not the Art., but the connection seems to involve it.—Wellhausen thinks the minute description of place here interpolated from xxvi. 1, because otherwise Saul's minute directions in vers. 22, 23, would be out of place; but the statement of the Ziphites is not so minute as to supersede the necessity of search for the fugitive, who might be in any one of a hundred places "in the wood on the hill."—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 19. Some MSS. have (probably wrongly) Habilah and Havilah.—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 21. Instead of הָכִינוּ "set your mind)," some MSS. have הָבִינוּ "understand, learn."—Tr.]

[16] [Ver. 22. Thenius reads רַגְלוֹ הַמְּהֵרָה "where his quick or fleet foot is," Sept. ἐν τάχει, an ingenious and smooth reading; yet the rugged Heb. text suits the hurry of the command better.—Tr.]

[17] [Ver. 25. The suffix, omitted in the Heb., is added in the Sept.—Erdmann renders "went down the cliff."—Tr.]

[18] [Ver. 26. Sept. "Saul and his men," a natural (and therefore suspicious) supplement.—Tr.]

[19] [Ver. 28. On the meaning of this name see Erdmann in Exposition.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1–14. *David's march against the Philistines to rescue Keilah.*

Ver. 1. David's recall to Judah by Gad, and the distress of a part of Judah in consequence of a Philistine inroad stood probably in pragmatical connection. In this, his people's time of need, David the fugitive was to do them a service by a successful feat of arms against the hereditary enemy; and this was to be of service to him by gaining for him higher consideration as God's chosen one for the throne and the helper of his people. The Philistines were warring against *Keilah*, a fortified city (ver. 7) in the lowland of Judah (Josh. xv. 44), according to the Onomasticon eight miles from Eleutheropolis towards Hebron, with an evil-disposed population, who acted ungratefully and treacherously toward David (verse 12), though he had saved them from imminent danger. Inhabitants of this city took part (Neh. iii. 17, 18) in the building of the wall of Jerusalem. According to Kiepert's map (from the Onom. *Κεειλά*, Ceila, or Ἐχελά), it lay somewhat south-west of Tarkumieh, and is, according to Tobler (3 Wand. 151), the present Kila, near the Philistine border.*—The Philistine inroad was also a *predatory incursion*, in which they had an eye to the grain which was threshed and stored in the threshing-floors. Ver. 2. The news of the Philistines' incursion determined David to attack them. It is probable, as we have already intimated, that he was brought to Judah by Gad for this purpose. But here, in David's inquiry of the Lord, the agent is not the prophet Gad (Ew.), of whom it is not said, that he remained with David after ch. xxii. 20, but the *high-priest Abiathar*† by Urim and Thummim, the expression "to inquire of Jehovah" being never used when the divine will was sought through a prophet, but undoubtedly of the high-priest's inquiry by the sacred lot (as in xxii. 10, 13, 15).—By this inquiry David learns God's will; to attack the Philistines and rescue Keilah is now a divine command with the promise of victory in the order: "Rescue Keilah."—Ver. 3. Against this David's men protest from the point of view of their present situation, which on merely human grounds was certainly not of a nature to inspire them with courage.—**We are afraid here in Judah**, namely, as persecuted fugitives, who have abandoned a comparatively safe abode for the present more dangerous one, and are now further to rush into this danger by open war against the Philistines; we are always in danger from Saul, and now shall we march against the Philistine ranks at Keilah? Being not safe in Judah,‡ ought we forsooth to go to Keilah against the Philistines? (אַף כִּי, comp. Hab. ii. 5; 1 Sam. xiv. 30; xxi. 6; Ew., § 354 *c* [="yea, is it that?" or: "how much more when?"—Tr.]).—Ver. 4. David holds to his resolution against these objections; to confirm it and to encourage his men he *again inquires of the Lord* and receives the same *affirmative answer* with the *assurance* that the Lord has given his enemies into his hand.—Though treated by the king as an outlaw, he yet maintains true love to his people, which impels him to help them in their need, and to show that, in spite of his undeserved sufferings, he will not sin against them by refusing to perform a deed of deliverance which is well-pleasing to God.—The "go down" indicates that David was still in the mountains of Judah whence he must descend in order to reach Keilah.—Ver. 5. In accordance with the divine declaration the attack on the Philistines was successful; David inflicted a severe defeat on them, and gained large booty, driving off their flocks. Thus he rescued the people of Keilah.—Ver. 6 is a supplementary historical explanation relative to the possibility of the inquiry of the Lord in vers. 2, 3, which was not possible without the high-priestly cape or ephod to which was attached the Urim and Thummim. The main point is that, when Abiathar fled from Saul to David, he brought with him the high-priestly dress from Nob. But it was before this time that Abiathar came to David; he came as fugitive (xxii. 20) before David went to Keilah, for before this David inquired of the Lord through the high-priestly oracle. Accordingly, the remark: "when Abiathar fled to David to Keilah" is an indefinite statement, in which Keilah is by anticipation put as the first goal of his flight. The Sept. correctly *explains:* "When Abiathar, the son of Ahitub, fled to David, the ephod was in his hand, and he had gone down with David to Keilah, the ephod in his hand." [Dr. Erdmann here gives not the reading of the Sept., but the Hebrew text as amended by Thenius after the Sept.; the Greek text, however does imply that Abiathar had come to Keilah *with* David, having fled to him before. Thenius' amended Heb. text would indicate the back reference of this statement in ver. 6; but the present Heb. text naturally means that it was at Keilah that Abiathar first came to David, and so it is understood by Ewald, Stanley and the *Bible Commentary*. In xxii. 20–23 it is not said *where* or *when* the priest reached David, and the statement may be an anticipatory conclusion of the narrative of the massacre, the intermediate fact xxiii. 1–5 being then taken up with its consequent procedures. Ewald also remarks that the account of the inquiry in xxiii. 2, 3 is differently worded from that in vers. 9–12; the former may have been by the prophet Gad, against which, however, as Erdmann remarks, is the use of the phrase "inquire of the Lord," which regularly refers to the sacred oracle.—On the whole, if we retain the Heb. text of ver. 6, we must hold that Abiathar joined David after the rescue of Keilah; but a slight change in the text* (which seems to be corrupt) will permit us to adopt the view of Thenius, Keil, Philippson, and Erdmann, which is in other respects more satisfactory. This latter is also the view of Wordsworth, while Bp. Patrick

* [Mr. Grove (in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, Art. Keilah) referring to Tobler's identification of Keilah with Kila says "thus another is added to the list of places which, though specified as in the 'lowland' are yet actually found in the mountains: a puzzling fact." In connection with the signification "fortress" given to Keilah by Gesenius and others, Mr. Grove also points to the expression "marvellous kindness in a *strong city*" in Ps. xxxi. 21 and to ver. 8 and the general tenor of the Psalm.—Tr.]

† [See on ver. 6.—Tr.]

‡ [*Bib. Com.:* "Implying that Keilah was not in Judah." Yet it may mean simply that the Philistines now had control of the region of Keilah.—Tr.]

* [Read: "When Abiathar, *etc.* fled to David, the ephod was in his hand, and he came down to Keilah."—Tr.]

adopts the other (referring to the employment of Urim and Thummim by Saul xxviii. 6, on which see Erdmann), but neither of these writers mentions the difficulties of the question.—Tr.].—Ver. 7. On hearing of David's march to Keilah, Saul imagines that God has given him into his hands. He thinks that he will act as an instrument of the Lord against David. His reason therefor is indeed external and superficial enough: "for he is there shut in in a city with gates and bars." (נִכַּר in pregnant sense = "look at, *ignore*, Deut. xxxii. 27, *despise, reject*," Jer. xix. 4); **into my hands** [Heb. hand], that is, he hath given him, by abandoning and rejecting him. By blinding and self-deception Saul has fallen into the dreadful illusion that it is David, instead of himself, that is rejected by God.—The difficulty of the pregnant expression [God has rejected him into my hands] no doubt occasioned the change in the Sept. to "sold."—**For he is shut in** in entering.* The *fact* that David has entered or been drawn into this city with gates and bars, Saul thinks equivalent to his being shut in.—Ver. 8. **And Saul caused the whole people to hear,** *summoned* them to war (comp. xv. 4). Such summons to war was a royal right. The reason assigned to the people for the summons was to drive out the Philistines. Saul's real purpose, which he could the more easily conceal under this pretext of war on the Philistines, was: **to besiege David and his men,** who were already in Keilah, the city with gates and bars. —Ver. 9. David, however, had information of these evil plans, which Saul was *forging* against him; the Heb. (חָרַשׁ) is literally "to work in metals," and so "vigorously to work evil," as in Prov. iii. 29; xiv. 22; comp. Hos. x. 13. [The "secretly" of Eng. A. V. is to be omitted.—Tr.]. This gives David occasion again to consult the divine oracle. **Bring hither the ephod,** said he to Abiathar (comp. xiv. 13; xxx. 7). The high-priestly dress had to be *brought*, because it was the sacred dress for official duties.—Ver. 10. This inquiry of the Lord by the ephod was connected with outspoken *prayer*, whereby is indicated the innermost kernel and most essential significance of this questioning of the divine oracle. In the invocation of God there is here to be noted 1) the designation of the covenant-God as the God *of Israel*, and 2) David's avowal that he is the *servant* of this God, in whose service he knew himself to be. The reason for his questions is given in the words: **I, thy servant, have heard that Saul seeks to come,** *etc.*—Ver. 11. The two questions. The *first* is: **Will the citizens of Keilah deliver me into his hand?**—"*Citizens*" (בַּעֲלֵי ק׳) comp. Josh. xxiv. 11, "citizens" of Jericho, 2 Sam. xxi. 12; Judg. ix. 6. That *this* question stands first is certainly surprising, since logically this position belongs to the *second* question: **Will Saul come down?** We cannot regard this as a mere inconcinnity in the narrative. We may see in it the expression of David's excited state of mind. Thenius' proposed reading in order to secure logical arrangement in the two questions, namely: "Saul comes . . . to destroy the city, in order that the citizens of Keilah may deliver me into his hand" (he omits the suffix in בַּעֲבוּרִי in ver. 10 and for הֲיַסְגִּרֻנִי reads הִסְגִּרֻנִי) is all the more hazardous and untenable, as no version gives any hint for such a reading.—The divine answer, which is affirmative, refers only to the second question. Therefore the first question is repeated in ver. 12, and is then answered in the affirmative. There is thus a sort of chiasm or crossing in the order of the questions and answers. Ver. 13. The certainty that Saul will come with an army, and that the men of Keilah will treacherously deliver him up,* determines David to depart with his band (about six hundred men) before Saul can carry out his plan. **They went about whither they went,** "whither their way led them" (Maurer), as chance circumstances required, without fixed plan or aim. A mode of warfare by means of scouts and spies now arose between the two men. They have precise information of each other's plans and enterprises. Saul soon learns that David has escaped from Keilah, and accordingly abandons his intended march thither.

Vers. 14. *David in the wilderness of Ziph and the treachery of the Ziphites towards him.* Ver. 14. *David's next place of abode* is in general *the wilderness*, that is, of Judah, and its sheltering *heights*; but "*the mountain in the wilderness of Ziph*" is specially mentioned as a more permanent dwelling-place. *Ziph* (different from the place named in Josh. xv. 24, which lay southwest of Arad), perhaps the present Kuseifeh (*Rob.* III., 184, 188 [Am. ed., II., 200]) Josh. xv. 55, lay farther north on the highland, about eight miles southeast of Hebron; see *Robins.*, II., 47 [Am. ed., I., 492] who found there a hill, Tell Zif, and near by considerable ruins of old fortifications. [Mr. Grove, who formerly objected to Robinson's conjecture, now accepts it, but puts Zif (= Ziph) three miles south of Hebron. See his Art. in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, and Dr. Hackett's note in Am. ed.—Tr.] Individual parts of the great wilderness of Judah, which extended from the north of Judah to the Amorite mountain in the south between the mountains of Judah and the Dead Sea, were named from the various cities on the border of the mountains and the wilderness; so, besides the wilderness of Ziph, the wilderness of Maon, whither David afterwards went from Ziph (ver. 25). *The mountain in the wilderness of Ziph* is probably the mount *Hachilah* of ver. 19. The general remark is here proleptically made that all Saul's attempts against David were vain. **Saul sought him every day,** not: throughout his life (Keil), but = continually; **but God gave him not into his (Saul's) hands.**—David was under the special protection of God. These words form the contrast to Saul's word, ver. 7: "God has rejected [delivered] him into my hand." After the general remark on the failure of *Saul's* continued attempts follows (ver. 15) the mention of special cases, and the description of *David's* persecution. Thus connected with the preceding this verse (15)

* לָבוֹא *eundo*—comp. לֵאמֹר *dicendo*, "saying." The Inf. with ל is often used to introduce a subordinate circumstance. Ew. § 280 *d*. Comp. 1 Ki. xvi. 7; Ps. lxxviii. 18; lxiii. 3; 1 Chr. xii. 8; Prov. xxvi. 2; Joel ii. 26.

* [They act, perhaps, partly from attachment to Saul, partly from policy.—Tr.]

is not a "useless repetition" (Then.); for, after the statement that Saul pursued David, it is here first declared that David *received information* of this pursuit, and then David's retreat in the wilderness is more exactly described by the word "*wood*," or thick wood (בַּחֹרְשָׁה, from חֹרֶשׁ, with ה parag.). Here, too, the forest is David's chief means of concealment. Perhaps the word is also a proper name [Horesh], so called from the forests, of which there is now no trace in that region.—Vers. 16–18. Here is related how Jonathan comforted and strengthened David, when the latter, having heard of Saul's attempts against him, greatly needed consolation. There is no ground for regarding this (Then.) as merely the essential content of the traditional narration of Jonathan's secret interview with David in ch. xx. It is another interview of Jonathan with his friend, whose distress and danger led him to hasten to him in order by consoling and encouraging words to give him the most precious proof of his faithful friendship.* The fact is especially emphasized that Jonathan went to David *into the wood;* there they could be safest from Saul. **He strengthened his hand in God**; that is, he revived his sunken courage (comp. Neh. xii. 18), by pointing to the divine promises, the divine protection, and the great things that God had in store for him. Not wholly correct and exhaustive is Clericus' remark: "he drew consolation from his innocence and God's promises."—Ver. 17. *The words* of Jonathan, explaining what was just before said. **Fear not**, is the key-note of Jonathan's address. As ground of which he points 1) to *God's almighty help:* **Saul's hand will not find thee,**—he is firmly convinced that he (David) is under God's protection, and that therefore Saul can gain no advantage over him,—and 2) to the fixed *divine decree:* **Thou wilt be king over Israel**; Jonathan was certain through divine illumination that David was called by the Lord to be king of Israel, and could therefore console and encourage him; for Saul could not make void God's counsel and will (comp. xx. 13 sq.). **I shall be next to thee,**—herein Jonathan shows 1) his absolute willingness to resign all claim to the throne, and 2) his hope that David will confer on him as a subject the place nearest in association to himself. **And so also Saul knows,** my father is sure that thou wilt be king. Saul must therefore have already learned this through the voice of God and of the people.—Ver. 18. A new covenant is made by the two men, comp. ch. xx. 16 sq., 42. Here, as there, the parting is briefly and vividly described: **David remained in the thicket—Jonathan went his way home.** [The two friends meet no more in life. How it would have been if Jonathan had lived we cannot tell; but all possible complications were avoided by his death. His life thus presents an untarnished picture of pure, self-denying friendship. This parting is one of the many dramatic situations that occur in this Book.—Tr.]

Vers. 19–24 a. The Ziphites betray to Saul David's abode among them; Saul forms with the betrayers his crafty scheme against David. Ver. 19 is connected with ver. 15, not with ver. 14 (Thenius). "*Ziphites,*" *people* of Ziph [without the Art.—Tr.] Some Ziphites went up to Saul *to Gibeah* to betray to him David's abode. *The mountain Hachilah,* with its wood and its rocks, lay "on the right of the *desert;*" that is, south of the waste region which stretched out on the west of the Dead Sea within the steppe of Judah. The Article indicates the desert to be that well-known desert in this region, the designation being almost a proper name [written as nom. pr. "Jeshimon" in Eng. A. V.—Tr.] So in Num. xxi. 20; xxiii. 28, a desert is called "*the desert*" [Eng. A. V. Jeshimon]. This is the desert northeastern border of the Dead Sea.—Ver. 20. The lively tone of the address of the Ziphites shows that they were somewhat passionate adherents of Saul, and acquainted with his most secret desires. *Two* things they say to him: 1) Come down to us, for all thy desire to get David in thy power may now be fulfilled; 2) it is our affair to deliver him up to thee. [*Bib.-Com.* less well renders: "it is in our power," *etc.*—Tr.].—Ver. 21. The feeling expressed in Saul's answer agrees with the Ziphites' word as to his keen desire to come down to them. He invokes God's blessing on them for their offer and promise. He remains true to his illusion that David is attempting his throne and life, and so committing a crime against God. He imagines that he is in a dangerous situation, and that the Ziphites had compassion on him or sympathy with him in making him this offer.—Ver. 22. He directs them how to act in order to gain information of every retreat of David in his constant shifting of place. "Fix your mind, observe" (supply לֵב as in Judg. xii. 6; 2 Chr. xxix. 36). The heaping up of synonyms is no argument against this rendering; the conception "*see*" is not thrice expressed (Then.), but there is a gradation, Saul describing in an animated manner how they are to get information of David's abode: "Keep a good look-out still, that ye may *learn*, and that ye may *see in what place his foot will be,*" that is, where he fixes himself in his wandering. "*Who has seen him*" refers to the last: "And see his place," *etc.* The words, in keeping with Saul's animated manner, are loosely put together, he having in mind the moment when the man who discovers David's abode comes to inform him. Saul affirms the necessity for this espionage in the remark: "for it is told me that he is very subtle." This trait of character in David agrees with what we otherwise know of him in this respect.—Ver. 23. Saul continues his directions, and cannot say enough (to satisfy himself) to exhort them to search in every nook and cranny. "Return to me *unto what is certain;*" that is, when you have gotten certain information. Not till then will he go down with them. He confidently declares that he will then seize him **among all the thousands of Judah**. The Alaphim, thousands are, according to Num. i. 16; x. 4, the larger divisions of the twelve Tribes.—Ver. 24 a. The Ziphites went back to their region before Saul, who, according to the agreement, was to follow later.

Vers. 24 b–28. *David retires to the wilderness of Maon, and is delivered from Saul.*—Ver. 24 b. The wilderness of *Maon* lay farther south. The name still exists, = Maïn, eight miles southeast

* [It is suggested in *Bib.-Com.* that Jonathan had informed David of his father's designs (ver. 15), but this is nowhere intimated.—Tr.]

of Hebron; the distance from Ziph is therefore only six miles. Maïn lies on a conical hill, which commands a wide view, so that Rob. (II., 433 [Am. Ed., I., 493–495]) thence saw nine cities of the hill-country of Judah, Maon, Carmel, Ziph, Juttah, Jattir, Socho, Anab, Eshtemoa, and Hebron (Josh. xv. 48–55). On the character of the ground see Van de Velde II. 107 sq. [Mr. Grove in Smith's *Bible Dict.* thinks that the wilderness of Maon formed part of the larger region called the Arabah, rendered in Eng. A. V. 1 Sam. xxiii. 24, "the plain."—Tr.].—David, doubtless in consequence of information received as to the designs of Saul and the Ziphites, betook himself to the wilderness of Maon.

Ver. 25. **And Saul . . . went**, namely, after he had gotten information from the Ziphites. The "*rock*," on which it is here presupposed that David was staying, and which was in the wilderness of Maon, is perhaps the conical hill of the present Maïn, whose summit is surrounded with ruins. He went down not (as Sept.) "into the rock," nor "to the rock" (Buns.), but "*descended the rock*," in order to conceal himself in the lowland or in the caves at its base. It is the same mountain that is mentioned in ver. 26, on opposite sides of which Saul and David found themselves. Here (ver. 26) David was *sore troubled* (נֶחְפָּז) *to escape Saul*, while, on his part, Saul attempted *to surround and seize him.*—Ver. 27. But suddenly, when David is in the greatest danger of being surrounded, Saul receives information of a *new Philistine incursion.* He must desist from farther pursuit. This was God's plan to save David. The Philistines had seized on the moment when Saul had withdrawn his men to the south in pursuit of David, to invade the upper part of the land.—Ver. 28. The place was called Sela hammahlekoth (סֶלַע הַמַּחְלְקוֹת). There are two explanations of the name: 1) rock of smoothness, that is, of *escape*, and 2) rock of dividings or *divisions.* The first (Ges., De Wette, Keil), takes the notion of "escape" from the signification of the verb (חָלַק) "to be smooth," for which application, however, only Jer. xxxvii. 12, and that very doubtfully, can be adduced. Further the substantive here used never means "escape," but always "distribution" (Josh. xi. 23; xii. 7; xviii. 10; Ezek. xlviii. 29) and "division" (1 Chr. xxvi. 1; xxvii. 1; 2 Chr. xxxi. 17) and it must so be taken here. This explanation is favored also by the word "therefore," which clearly refers to the circumstantially related fact that the armies of Saul and David were separated, divided by the rock. *Ewald's* explanation: "lot of fate" (= חֵלֶק) is unfounded. It accordingly means: "Rock of division." Cler.: "rock of divisions, where Saul and David were separated." The rock *divided* the two armies, *held them asunder.* Böttcher conjectures that the rock might originally from its nature have been called "rock of *smoothness*," and this name might afterwards from historical recollection have been made to refer to the movements of Saul and David, who according to ver. 26 had *divided* the rock-ground between them. Certainly this explanation of the name "Rock of dividings, partings," would be possible as respects the ground. But, by reason of the "therefore," the reference to Saul and David's relation to one another suits the connection better.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. David did not seek, but received from the Lord's hand the opportunity by the march to Keilah to perform a heroic deed, and thus to win further consideration in the eyes of the people as a warrior blessed by God and crowned with glorious success. The king left the city open to the attacks of the Philistines. He neglected his duty as protector of his people against the hereditary foe, thinking only of revenging himself on David. Here also David was under God's protection, to which he humbly resigned himself. After he had at the Lord's command returned from Moab to Judah, he must, in the fact that the Philistines undisturbed besieged Keilah and carried off the grain, while Saul took no steps to oppose them, have recognized God's command to draw the sword for his people, especially as he was the king's general, though he had received no order from the king. But for his conscience and his assurance of faith, as well as for the certainty and success of the whole undertaking, he needed the divine authorization; if he had not the sanction of the theocratic king, he must have that of God Himself, since the question was of a matter important for the people of God and for the affairs of God's kingdom in Israel,—war against Israel's hereditary foe. He received the divine authorization and the promise of success through a twice affirmed divine oracle. By the divine promise he is inwardly certain of success. Even in straits and danger, he now with the Lord's support becomes the saviour of his people out of straits and danger. But in the deed of deliverance itself lies the seed of new suffering. The rescue of Keilah by David occasioned Saul's march to Keilah against David. The inhabitants of Keilah exhibit base ingratitude towards him. By God's word he learns what dangers here threaten him. By God's direction he again takes to flight to save himself from Saul—but the incursion of the Philistines, occasioned by Saul's march to the south, compels him to desist from following David, who thus escapes his persecutor. Thus this section exhibits David anew in the clearest light of divine guidance as the Chosen and Anointed of God: 1) submitting himself unconditionally to God's determining word and guiding will, and 2) guided directly by God's hand and determined in all his affairs by God's will and word.

2. Whatever may have been the *form of the inquiry of God* through the Urim and Thummim (which was attached to the ephod of the high-priest), yet in this section it is clearly and distinctly indicated that it was an *embodied prayer to God for the revelation of His will*, and only to such prayer was God's counsel and will thus revealed. One's own natural objection and other men's opposition to God's will must by this repeated questioning of the Lord and decision and confirmation of His will be most completely refuted and set aside. Flesh-and-blood's deliberations concerning what pertains to God's kingdom lead to indecision, doubt, timidity; taking counsel with God in direct access to His grace and truth makes the

heart firm and the look clear, and gives true courage and victorious prowess, as is shown by the example of David, who repeatedly *inquired of the Lord*.

3. The teaching of the Ziphites forms the *historical background* of Ps. liv., the *title* of which refers its origin to David's thence resulting sorrowful experiences, 1 Sam. xxiii. 19 sq. In full accordance with his then dangerous situation and with a backward glance at God's wonderful help, he first utters a *prayer* for deliverance from wicked and ungodly enemies, vers. 3-5 (1-3), and then expresses his *assurance* of divine help, together with the promise of thanksgiving for deliverance, vers. 6-9 (4-7).

4. Out of these *great experiences*, in David's sorrowful life, of the grace and power, wisdom and justice, mercy and goodness of God, was developed in him and through him in his people that intelligence of faith and theological knowledge which we see in the Psalms and the prophetical writings.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 2. STARKE: God forsakes not those who seek Him (Ps. ix. 11 [10]). When we wish to begin any thing, we should first ask counsel of God.—Ver. 3. CRAMER: Flesh and blood trembles when at God's command we have to encounter danger. SCHMID: Corrupt human reason always has something which it opposes to the word of God.—Ver. 4. STARKE: When we have God's will on our side, we should not let ourselves be led astray by men (Acts xxi. 13, 14). The shield of the pious is with God, who helps pious hearts (Ps. vii. 11 [10]).—Ver. 5. CRAMER: In trouble God yet sometimes gives a joyous day, and after the troublous storm He shows a glimpse of His grace (Eccl. vii. 14).—Ver. 7. OSIANDER: Hypocrites have God's name in the mouth, but the devil always in the heart. And although they speak of God, yet they have always a bloody mind against God's people (Ps. l. 16, 17).—Vers. 11, 12. God foresees not only what will really happen, but also what would follow if this and that should happen. His omniscience and foreknowledge is a boundless and bottomless sea (Acts xxvii. 24-31).—The greatest benefits are often requited with the greatest ingratitude, and this is a shameful evil among men, which then most betrays itself when they should be thankful. —SCHLIER: True thankfulness which fears God knows well how to find out the right. Let us be thankful in all things! We need not for that reason do wrong when the point is to be thankful, but when true thankfulness fills the heart there open up ways enough to show it.—Ver. 16 sq. OSIANDER: It is a work acceptable to God to comfort the afflicted (Isa. xl. 1; 1 Thess. v. 14). —God is wont always to refresh again His people who are in danger, that they may not utterly sink under the cross (2 Cor. vii. 6).—STARKE: True friendship must be grounded in communion with God. Real love does not diminish, but increases. —SCHLIER: God lets a David be persecuted—lets him be driven about like a hunted animal; but at His own time He also sends him a Jonathan with friendly words. And so God the Lord still always does to all His servants.—F. W. KRUMMACHER: The picture of this pair of friends—a picture nobler and more exalting than that of the heathen Dioscuri, beams inextinguishably in the heaven of the church, as a kindling and inspiring ideal of unfeigned manly friendship, sanctified in God.—Vers. 25 sq. STARKE: God never leaves one that loves Him without a cross, and when one cross has ceased, another is at once ready (Ps. lxxiii. 14).—OSIANDER: God often lets His people fall into extreme need, so that they can neither counsel nor help themselves, in order that the divine help may be so much the more recognized and honored (Matt. viii. 25).—CRAMER: God lets nothing so bad happen, but that He knows how to make out of it something good (Gen. l. 20).—WUERT. BIB.: Even enemies must serve our God in reserving His believing children from peril or need (2 Pet. ii. 9).—Ver. 28. OSIANDER: The benefits of God we should with thankful mind keep in lively remembrance (Ps. ciii. 2).—SCHLIER: Why is it that the Lord very often helps only when the need has reached its height? It is in order that we may give the honor to the Lord alone.—F. W. KRUMMACHER: David was delivered "at the last hour," it is true; but this never strikes too late for the Lord still to furnish in it the proof to those that trust in Him, that His word is Yea and Amen when it says, "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee."

J. DISSELHOFF: *How trying days should be borne after God's heart:* 1) By despairing of all self-help and believingly fleeing to God's heart, there to learn supplication and thanksgiving. 2) By opening heart and hand amid our own need for others' need. 3) By contending with the weapons of gentleness and humility against the supposed or real authors of the trials.

[Vers. 7-13. *David at Keilah.* 1) Saul eagerly arranges to seize him: *a*) Rejoicing beforehand in a success taken for granted. "Counting the chickens," *etc.; b*) Inferring that God was on his side from the mere prospect of a single success; *misinterpreting Providence*, comp. xxiv. 4. 2) The citizens of Keilah ready to betray him—doubtless remembering Nob; *Ingratitude*—which always finds itself some excuse. 3) David sees reason to fear them, and seeks divine direction: *a*) He speaks humbly as God's servant; *b*) He earnestly implores direction. *Prayer*. In answer to humble and earnest prayer, God often delivers from ungrateful friends and scheming foes.

[Vers. 16-18. *The last meeting of Jonathan and David:* 1) David feeble and fearful ("strengthened," "fear not"). Naturally discouraged by cowardly ingratitude, malignant hostility, weary wandering, uncertainty of life. 2) Jonathan encourages him: *a*) By the mere fact of coming to meet him through difficulties and dangers; *b*) By piously pointing him to God; *c*) By confident assurances of preservation and triumph; *d*) By declaring that his great enemy himself knows this, comp. xxiv. 20; *e*) By avowing his own willingness to be second to David. 3) They renew their league of friendship before the Lord (comp. xviii. 3; xx. 16, 42). They part to meet no more on earth. Jonathan is next mentioned in David's pathetic lament (2 Sam. i. 17-27).

[Vers. 25-27. *David's narrow escape:* 1) He is betrayed by men of his own tribe (ver. 19), and

skilful plans are laid to apprehend him (vers. 22–3). 2) Hard pressed, fleeing in haste, surrounded (ver. 26). 3) Prays to God for help and deliverance (Psalm liv.). 4) Strangely delivered at the last moment by overruling Providence (ver. 27).—Tr.]

VI. *David in the Wilderness of Engedi. He spares Saul in the cave. His conversation with Saul.*

Chap. XXIV. [Eng. A. V. XXIII. 29—XXIV. 22].

29 (1) And David went up from thence and dwelt in [*ins.* the] strongholds at [of]
1 (2) Engedi.[1] And it came to pass, when Saul was returned from following the
Philistines, that it was told him, saying, Behold, David is in the wilderness
2 (3) of Engedi. Then [And] Saul took three thousand chosen men [men chosen]
out of all Israel, and went to seek David and his men upon the rocks of the
3 (4) wild goats.[2] And he came to the sheep-cotes by [on] the way, where [and
there] was a cave, and Saul went in to cover his feet;[3] and David and his
4 (5) men remained [were abiding] in the sides of the cave. And the men of
David said unto him, Behold the day of which the Lord [Jehovah] said unto
thee, Behold, I will deliver thine enemy into thine hand, that thou mayest do
to him as it shall seem good unto thee. Then [And] David arose, and cut
5 (6) off the skirt of Saul's robe privily. And it came to pass afterward that
6 (7) David's heart smote him because he had cut off Saul's skirt.[4] And he said
unto his men, The Lord [Jehovah] forbid[5] that I should do this thing unto
my master [lord], the Lord's [Jehovah's] anointed, to stretch forth mine
7 (8) hand against him, seeing [for] he is the anointed of the Lord [Jehovah]. So
[And] David stayed[6] his servants [men] with these [*om.* these] words, and
suffered them not to rise against Saul. But [And] Saul rose up out of the
cave, and went on *his* way.
8 (9) David also [And David] arose afterward and went out of the cave and
cried after Saul, saying, My lord the king. And when [*om.* when] Saul
looked behind him, [*ins.* and] David stooped with his face to the earth and
9 (10) bowed himself. And David said to Saul, Wherefore hearest[7] thou men's
10 (11) words, saying, Behold, David seeketh thy hurt? Behold, this day thine eyes
have seen how that the Lord [Jehovah] had [*om.* had] delivered thee to-day
into my hand in the cave, and *some* bade[8] *me* kill thee; but [and] *mine eye*
spared thee, and I said, I will not put forth my hand against my lord, for he

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 29 (1). See the various VSS. in this verse as an illustration of the uncertainty in proper names.—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 2 (3). "On the face of the rocks." Possibly we have here a proper name, the Jeelim or ibex-rocks.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 3 (4). Explained in all the VSS. as—τὰς φυσικὰς ἐκκρίσεις ποιήσασθαι (so Erdmann), except Syr., which has "to sleep."—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 5 (6). All ancient VSS., except Chald., read: "the skirt of Saul's robe," and so some MSS. In the present Heb. text we should expect the Art. before כנף, and, apparently, we should either supply the Art., or adopt the reading of the VSS.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 6 (7). Literally: "a profane thing be it to me from Jehovah."—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 7 (8). This word וַיְשַׁסַּע is variously rendered by the VSS.: συνεκάλεσεν, περιέσπασεν, ἔπεισεν, ἠπάτησεν, Chald. "quieted" (פַּיֵּס), Syr. "caused to repent, turned aside" (so Eng. A. V.), Arab. "threateningly admonished," Vulg. "confregit." Levy suggests וישמע as the reading of the Vat. Sept. (ἔπεισε). The Heb. word contains a strong figure (so Gesen. and Erdmann) "cut up"—"hindered, restrained."—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 9 (10). Or: "hearkenest thou to."—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 10 (11). אָמַר, indefinite as in xxiii. 22 (Maurer), so Syr., Arab., Chald. The phrase, however, presents some difficulties. It is objected (*Bib. Com.*) that the subject of אָמַר in the present Heb. text is naturally "Jehovah," so that it would read: "and Jehovah said (commanded) to kill thee;" but this is not necessarily required by the grammar, and is in David's mouth impossible (*Bib. Com.*). Thenius rejects the sense of "command" here as belonging to later Heb. (but it is found in 2 Sam. i. 18; xvi. 11), and adopts the reading לֹא אָבִיתִי,

11 (12) is the Lord's [Jehovah's] anointed. Moreover [And] my father,[9] see, yea see
the skirt of thy robe in my hand; for, in that I cut off the skirt of thy robe
and killed thee not, know thou and see that there is neither evil nor trans-
gression in mine hand, and I have not sinned against thee; yet thou huntest[10]
12 (13) my soul to take it. The Lord [Jehovah] judge between me and thee, and
the Lord [Jehovah] avenge me of thee; but my hand shall not be upon thee.
13 (14) As[11] saith the proverb of the ancients, Wickedness proceedeth from the wicked.
14 (15) But my hand shall not be upon thee. After whom is the king of Israel come
out? after whom dost thou pursue? after a dead dog, after a [one][12] flea.
15 (16) The Lord therefore [And Jehovah] be judge, and judge between me and
thee, and see, and plead my cause, and deliver [judge][13] me out of thine
hand.
16 (17) And it came to pass, when David had made an end of speaking these words
17 (18) unto Saul, that Saul said, Is this thy voice, my son David? And Saul lifted
up his voice and wept. And he said to David, Thou art more righteous than
I, for thou hast rewarded [done][14] me good, whereas [and] I have rewarded
18 (19) [done] thee evil. And thou hast showed this day how that thou hast dealt
well with me,[15] forasmuch as when the Lord [Jehovah] had [*om.* had] deli-
19 (20) vered me into thine hand, thou killedst me not. For, if a man find his ene-
my, will he let him go well away? wherefore the Lord [Jehovah] reward
20 (21) thee good for that [what] thou hast done unto me this day.[16] And now,
behold I know well [*om.* well] that thou shalt surely be king,[17] and that the
kingdom of Israel shall be established in thine hand. Swear now therefore
unto me by the Lord [Jehovah] that thou wilt not cut off my seed after me,
22 (23) and that thou wilt not destroy my name out of my father's house. And
David sware unto Saul. And Saul went home [to his house], but [and] David
and his men gat them up into[18] the hold.

"I did not wish," after the Sept. οὐκ ἠβουλήθην, adding that the Heb. text is most readily explained from the Vulg.: "*et cogitavi ut occiderem te*," whence Heb. וָאֹמַרְתִּי (so *Bib. Com.*). Both these readings (and ו with Impf.) Wellhausen rejects, and reads after Sept. וָאֵמָאֵן (as in 1 Sam. viii. 19), which is more probable from the form (the present Heb might easily come from it), and gives a good sense. We cannot infer anything as to the text from Josephus' omission of this clause.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 11 (12). The mutilation of the Sept. here loses the expression of excitement which is so natural to the occasion.—Tr.]

[10] Ver. 11 (12). Sept. δεσμεύεις—"bindest in toils"—"huntest."—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 13 (14). Wellhausen holds this verse to be an interpolation because its last clause is identical with the last clause of the preceding verse; but would not this repetition here be very natural?—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 14 (15). The rendering "one" for אֶחָד is more lively, yet not linguistically necessary; the numeral is sometimes used as Indef. Art., as in 1 Sam. i. 1.—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 15 (16). Of the three words here rendered "judge" the second and third are the same in the Heb. (שָׁפַט, indicating the act of a governor-judge) and the first different from these (דַּיָּן—a judicial officer).—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 17 (18). The sense of retribution is sometimes, but not always found in this word (גָּמַל).—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 18 (19). This clause seems awkward. We would expect: "thou hast showed thy willingness to deal well," or simply: "thou hast dealt well," for the "showing" and the "dealing" are identical in content; nor does the Sept. ἀπήγγειλας help. Perhaps we should render: "Thou hast showed this day that thou dealest well," that is, that such is thy purpose and policy.—Tr.]

[16] [Ver. 19 (20). On this text see Erdmann in the Exposition.—Tr.]

[17] [Ver. 20 (22). Here one MS. and Arab. add אַחֲרַי, "after me," an obvious supplement.—Tr.]

[18] [Ver. 22 (23). Heb. עַל, "upon," but thirty MSS. read אֶל, "to."—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1-8 [29-7]. *David's abode in Engedi* and his meeting there with Saul in a *cave*.—Ver. 1 [29]. *Engedi* the present Ain Jidy (Jeddi), "Fountain of the kid" (Ἐγγαδί, Ἐγγαδαί, Ptol. 5, 16, 8), about the middle of the west shore of the Dead Sea, about thirteen miles north-east of Maon on the border of the wilderness of Judah, in a mountainous region with limestone-soil, with precipitous rocks and deep gorges which run towards the Dead Sea, and with many caves in the limestone-hills. It belonged to the then few very fruitful regions of the wilderness of Judah.—[For a good account of Engedi with its magnificent scenery, its frightful and dangerous rock-passes and its many roomy caverns, see *Bib. Com. in loco*. Thomson, in "*The Land and the Book*," speaks of the wild goats still to be found there.—Tr.]—Ver. 2 [1] sq. The obstinacy of Saul's adherence to his bloody plan against David appears in the fact that immediately after his campaign against the Philistines, perhaps even before they were completely overthrown, he again sends out spies against David, and sets out with a large body of warriors (3000) in order to seize him.

He sees in him a rival king, against whom he must march fully equipped, and whom he must destroy by a superior force of disciplined troops. **The ibex-rocks**, so called by the people perhaps, because from their steepness and wildness the ibexes or wild-goats could subsist there. See *Rob.* II. 432 [Am. Ed. I. 500]. Mountain-goats still abound there. In the hardly accessible gorges and caves Saul with his men sought David and his followers, rightly supposing that the latter, being few in number, would seek to hide in this region so full of hiding-places. There were and are caves there wherein thousands might hide. —The words: **The sheepcotes on the way** indicate (like the "ibex-rocks") a well-known locality, which from its fruitfulness in this otherwise waste region served for the abode of flocks. [Thomson saw many sheepfolds at the mouths of caves; they were made by piling stones up in a circle and covering them with thorns.—Tr.]. Saul looks out a cave in the vicinity **to cover his feet**, that is, to obey a call of nature, when the Orientals usually cover their feet (the ancient Vss. [except Syr.], Keil, Then.), *not:* "to sleep" (Mich., Ew. [Syr.]). **David and his men abode within** or in the *back of the cave* [ver. 4 (3)], while Saul was in front not far from the entrance. The description supposes a very large cave, of such as are numerous there. But whether this cave is to be identified (as Van de Velde supposes) with the one near the village *Chareitun* in the Wady of the same name southwest of the Frank Mountain and north-east of Tekoa (it is a limestone arch with many side-passages and wide dark rear-spaces) is uncertain, inasmuch as the latter on account of its proximity to Tekoa would be reckoned to the wilderness of Tekoa rather than to the wilderness of Engedi, and besides is from fourteen to nineteen miles from Engedi, which does not seem to have been the case with the one here described. [De Saulcy (*B. Com.*) suggests Bir-el-Mauquouchieh near Wady Hasasa as the place.—Tr.].—Ver. 5 [4]. David's men advise him to seize this opportunity, given him, as they think, by God, to rid himself of his deadly foe. **See, this is the day of which the Lord said to thee.**—The Lord's "*saying*" can here be understood only in the general sense of the divine ordering of this favorable opportunity. This day, with its fortunate meeting, seemed to them a hint and direction from God. A reference to a definite divine declaration,* given to David through a prophet (Clericus: "There would come a time when, his enemies all conquered and prostrate, he would peacefully govern Israel") is not in the words themselves.—Saul had laid aside his *upper garment* [robe] for his present purpose [or, remaining on him, it may have been spread out. —Tr.]. The situation was such that David could, without being observed, cut off a *corner* of the upper garment. David wished to have in hand this sign that Saul had been *defenceless* in his power, and that he could have killed him, in order to use it with Saul at the proper time. **His heart smote him**, not with fright at the bold undertaking (Then., Ew.), for the deed was already done, but in the *ethical* sense: his conscience smote him. From what follows it is clear that David regarded Saul's person as sacred; he reproached himself with having secretly cut off a piece of his garment, and thus failed in reverence for his person. Cler.: "David was afraid that Saul would take this, though a clear sign of (David's) magnanimity, in bad part, and regard it as a violation of his royal majesty."—Ver. 7 [6]. The decisive and solemn rejection of the advice of the warriors to assail Saul. **Be it far from me from the Lord**, that is, on the Lord's account; it is a religious ground which restrains him from following the advice of his men. For *God's sake* he will not do it, because Saul is the anointed of the Lord, a person made sacred by the Lord. And therefore also David could not have received command from the Lord to deal with Saul according to his good pleasure.—Ver. 8 [7]. "*David cut down his men with words*" (שִׁסַּע "to rend, cut to pieces," then figuratively "cut down with words" *verbis dilaceravit*), Luther "beat back" (*abweisen*), too weak [so Eng. A. V. "stayed."—Tr.]; Berl. Bib. better: "pulled away" (*abreissen*). David was obliged to hold back his men with reproving words from taking bloody vengeance on Saul. We must suppose that Saul went alone into the cave at a distance from his people, and did not suspect that such a body of men lay immediately behind his back.

Vers. 9–23 [8–22]. *The conversation of David and Saul at a distance.*—Ver. 9 [8]. David uses this God-given opportunity to assure his persecutor of his innocence, and to lodge a sting in his conscience. His words are a declaration (wrung out by suffering) from heart to heart, from conscience to conscience. The address: **My Lord, O king!** indicates the double point of view whence David in what follows declares by *deed* and by *word* his relation and attitude to Saul. He recognizes and honors Saul *as his lord* to whom he feels himself bound to be subject; in calling him his *lord* he declares himself guiltless of insurrection against him. In the *king* he sees the *anointed* of the Lord, the bearer of the holy theocratic office, in which character he was inviolable. In calling him king he affirms that he is far from attacking his person and working him harm. To this *address* corresponds David's behaviour, his gesture of deepest reverence: **he bent his face to the earth and bowed himself.**—Ver. 10 [9]. David refers first to the *calumnies* by which he had been blackened to Saul as his enemy seeking his destruction. Compare the title of Ps. vii., which refers to the present situation; there were calumniating go-betweens, one of whom was the otherwise unknown Benjamite Cush, who stood, therefore, in the same category with the Ziphites and Doeg. Saul *hearkened* to these slanders and believed them, because his heart was full of mistrust and hate against David.—Ver. 11 [10]. David expressly represents it as a divinely ordered circumstance that Saul was put into his power. He also expressly affirms that the temptation to kill him was presented to him (אָמַר "one said" as in xxiii. 22), but at the same time declares that he spared him; to the "spared" of the Heb. supply "my eye" [so Eng. A. V.—Tr.], as in Gen. xlv. 20; Deut. vii. 16 (so most expositors) or

* [Some cite 1 Sam. xv. 28; xvi. 1, 12, and also xx. 15; xxiii. 17, but it is not probable that David's men would know these. Of any other promise we have no mention.—Tr.]

"my hand" or "my soul" (Cler.). He further gives the *reason* which deterred him from laying hand on Saul, his lord: **for he is the Lord's anointed.**—By the royal anointing, as a divine act, Saul's person was for him sacred, inviolable. —Ver. 12 [11]. **And my father**; with this address David passes from his relation to Saul as king to the divinely ordered relation which he occupied towards him as *father*. To this "my father" answers Saul's "my son." David calls Saul father *not* (as Grotius thinks) because he was his father-in-law, but to indicate the pious* feeling which so fills his heart as he speaks, that he involuntarily breaks out into this address. See ver. 17 [16] and xxvi. 17.—**See, yea see.**—A lively introduction of *the factual proof of what he had just said* that Saul had been given into his hand so that he could have done to him what he would. The "**yea**" (גַּם) is here intensive, not merely copulative (Ges. § 155, 2 *a*). The skirt of the upper garment in David's hand is to be at the same time ocular proof that David is innocent of the wicked accusations brought against him by the calumniators. With *his innocence*, set forth in heaped up words: "in my hand is no evil nor transgression, and I have not sinned against thee," he next contrasts (with the adversative phrase "*and thou*" and in curt, incisive words) Saul's *criminal conduct* towards him: **Thou workest after my soul**, properly "huntest my soul;" Cler.: "A very suitable phrase concerning a man whom his enemy was pursuing like a beast over mountains and forests;" Sept.: "bindest," with allusion to the nets of the hunter, and so, in accordance with this figure, it is added: **to take it**, Vulg. *ut auferas eam*.—Ver. 13 [12] is similarly to be taken from the point of view that he has no evil design against Saul.—**The Lord will judge between me and thee**, that is, though the Lord gave thee into my hand, I attempted, and shall attempt nothing against thee, because I leave the decision wholly to the Lord. Here speaks submission to God's will, leaving to him the decision concerning right and wrong, innocence and guilt. **And the Lord will avenge me of thee**,—the expression of David's confidence that for his guilty conduct towards his (David's) innocence Saul will not go unpunished, that against him will be manifested the weight of the divine punitive justice.—**But my hand shall not be against thee**, as I have hitherto been, so I will continue to be pure from crime against thee; *God's* hand will punish thy injustice towards me, *my* hand shall not touch thee.—Ver. 14 [13]. David grounds this declaration of innocence on the reference to its inner foundation and root by means of an "old proverb:" *from the evil comes evil*, evil doing springs from an evil heart. Cler. well explains: "David means to say that if he had been guilty of conspiracy against the king, he would not have neglected this favorable opportunity to kill him, since men usually indulge their feelings, and from a mind guilty of conspiracy nothing but corresponding deeds could come forth." Compare the Greek proverb: κακοῦ κόρακος κακὸν ᾠόν ["from a bad raven a bad egg," see Matt. vii. 15–20.—Tr.]—Grotius: "Actions usually correspond to the quality of the mind." The repetition of the words: "but my hand shall not be against thee," after the proverb is the declaration of innocence: "*I am* not wicked and criminal, and, therefore, according to the old proverb, I shall undertake and do nothing evil against thee, wreak no vengeance on thee."—Ver. 15 [14] David points out how foolish, superfluous and unroyal is Saul's persecuting campaign against a mean, undangerous man like him. Grot.: "A very pathetic appeal and a proof of David's very great modesty." Comp. Ps. cxxxi. **The king of Israel** is with special emphasis made to follow the "*after whom?*" in contrast with the position and significance of the person persecuted by him. With the *king of Israel* adorned with *honor* and *power* David contrasts himself under the figure of a *dead dog:* 1) as a *despised, lowly*, qualitatively *insignificant* man, comp. xvii. 43; 2 Sam. iii. 8, where the figure of a *dog* represents a man despicable in the eyes of one who is, or is supposed to be of high standing; 2) as a *harmless, or in no wise dangerous man*, comp. the figure of the dead dog, 2 Sam. ix. 8; xvi. 9.—The comparison with the *flea* adds the idea of the quantitatively *petty, mean*, comp. xxvi. 20. "Wherefore," would David say, "O thou *mighty* king of Israel, dost thou summon thy army against so little and insignificant a man?" Berl. Bib.: "against *a single flea*, which is not easily caught, and easily escapes, and if it is caught, is poor game for a royal hunter." No more than a dead dog can harm, and a flea endanger thee, *am I*, apart from the fact that I have no wish thereto, *in position* to work thee destruction.—Ver. 16 [15]. *Therefore*—because Saul persecutes him unjustly as an *innocent* man, and foolishly as an *undangerous* man, because he, David, is unjustly slandered and persecuted as a malicious enemy of Saul—he appeals to the Judge who alone is just and gives success to a righteous cause. *Two* things David here says: 1) he repeats his appeal to the judicial decision of the Lord (ver. 13 [12]), and 2) declares his firm conviction that the Lord will by such decision help him to his rights against Saul: **He will conduct my cause**, that is, the just God, before whom I am not only consciously, but really innocent, will be my advocate, undertake my cause; **and do me justice from thy hand**, I shall be delivered out of thy hand, freed from the sufferings which thou preparest me. A zeugmatic construction.—[Rather a pregnant construction: "will judge me (and thus deliver me) from thy hand."—Tr.]*

Ver. 17 [16]. *Saul's answer to these words of David* shows that they deeply and powerfully

* [That is the *reverence*, the *pietas* of the Romans.—Tr.]

* [Philippson: "This address of David has so much natural eloquence, so much glow, and such a tone of conviction, that no one who has any sense for the simple beauties of the Bible can read it without being moved. The whole situation, too, is noble: David, standing on the rocky height in the desert, holding on high the trophy of his magnanimity, looking at and addressing the melancholy Saul, whom he loved as a father, honored as king, revered as the Lord's Anointed, who yet without ground hated him and persecuted him with relentless and deadly zeal—using the opportunity with rapid words, which expressed his deepest feelings, to touch the heart of his enemy—he himself full of humility, oppressed by indescribable suffering and weighed down by the feeling of powerlessness, yet inspired by the consciousness of a noble deed."—Tr.]

impressed his mind and sharply pricked his conscience. The address: **Is that thy voice, my son David?** indicates by its soft, mild tone that David's words, issuing from a deeply-moved heart, and in the "my father" and "thou king of Israel, my lord," expressing profound piety and reverence, had struck a chord in Saul's inner life on the side of *feeling and disposition*, which he *could not help* letting sound forth in this address counter to the fierceness and hate that otherwise possessed him. The sign of this sudden awakening of nobler feeling is *Saul's weeping aloud*. There is no hypocrisy or pretence here. Saul, tossed powerless hither and thither by fierce passions without self-control and without harmony of soul-life, is here laid hold of in a hidden corner of his heart, where he was still accessible to the power of truth, and involuntarily yields to this nobler arousing of his soul, though it is not destined to be permanent.—Ver. 18 [17]. On this *psychologically* so significant address follows the *ethically* so important *confession*: **Thou art more righteous than I, for thou hast done me good, and I have done thee evil.**—This proves that his *conscience* was touched by David's word, which had so sharply contrasted innocence and baseless persecution, righteousness and unrighteousness. Saul *must* do honor to the truth; the overwhelming force of David's words, founded in truth, forces this confession from him; though a thorough and permanent change for the better is not thereby effected in his heart. Grotius: "The confession is unwillingly extorted, the mind being nothing bettered." But we see from this of how high a degree of good Saul was capable, if he had been willing to deny himself. The *mode* in which David's word so struck his conscience that he was compelled involuntarily to acknowledge his *innocence* and the *justice* of his cause is indicated by his own words; it was his perception of the glaring contrast between his evil, destructive operations against David, and the wholly opposite conduct of the latter, who did only good to the hostile king: *The requital of evil with good*. Saul thinks of all the good that David had done him by his faithful service. By right moral conduct, absolutely accordant with God's holy will, and simple avowal springing from truth and from the heart, a deep impression for the better may under certain circumstances be made on the corruptest and most hardened nature.—Ver. 19 [18]. In proof of this affirmation Saul adduces David's *present behaviour*, which is distinguished from the preceding: "thou hast done me good."—**And thou hast to-day showed,** hast given a proof of **what good thou hast done to me, namely therein, that the Lord had delivered me into thy hand;*** Saul also here recognizes the fact that it was *God's hand* that had to-day delivered him into David's hand, in contrast with his previous declarations that God had given David into *his* hand, xxiii. 7.—**But thou didst not kill me,** thou didst not use the opportunity given thee by God's providence, because thou wishest not to avenge thyself on me, and thinkest only good towards me. All this is a splendid justification of David and confirmation of the assertions that he made to Saul.—Ver. 20 [19]. Thenius, from the Sept., Syr. and Arab., undertakes to restore the supposed original text of this verse as follows: 1) after "his enemy," we are to hold, stood originally "in straits" (בַּצָּרָה). Thenius thinks this reading "necessary," since one might find his enemy without having opportunity to hurt him; but this opportunity is especially afforded when he finds him *in angustiis*, "in straits." But this is a hair-splitting and far-fetched argument, since the connection does not leave it doubtful what is meant by *finding* the enemy. "*Find*" here as in xxiii. 17; Ps. xxi. 9 [8]; Isa. x. 10, means so to come upon as to affect with suffering or punishment,="get into one's power." 2) After טוֹבָה [Eng. A. V. after "well away."—Tr.] Then. supposes "the Lord will reward him good" to have fallen away, and 3) instead of the last words of the verse, to have originally stood: "the Lord reward thee good for what thou hast to-day done to me." But the authority of the versions is the less decisive here, because their purpose is obvious, to avoid a harshness and produce conformity. They included the whole sentence in the protasis: "if one find his enemy and send him away," and there was no apodosis. To supply this apodosis and correspondingly to express the good which Saul afterwards wishes David, they added: "the Lord will reward him good."—The words, as they stand in the text, give even according to Thenius a "tolerable sense;" yea more, they give a satisfactory sense if we translate: **If one find his enemy, will he let him go on a good way** (a peaceful, unimperilled way)? that is, it is usual, when one has his enemy in his power, not to let him go in peace untouched. In the lively feeling with which Saul speaks, the omission of the intermediate thought, the expression of which might be expected, namely, "so hast thou not acted towards me," is quite natural. The negative answer to this question is omitted (an omission psychologically easily understood), and immediately follows the *wish*: **The Lord reward thee good for what thou hast this day done to me.** (So Maur., De Wette, Buns., Keil.) That Saul at this moment truly and honestly meant these words, is beyond doubt; it is the witness not only of a *bright*, but also of a *good* moment in his inner life, though indeed no deep and permanent improvement followed. Under the influence of David's presence and words the evil spirit had for a moment yielded to the good.—Ver. 21 [20] sq. Following the *better* impulse of his heart Saul sees *clearly* that the theocratic kingship will pass from him and his house to David, and only through him as its future bearer be permanently established. How did Saul come to this *knowledge* which he here expresses, and which Jonathan had already affirmed that his father had (xxiii. 17)? Not through direct divine revelation, but by the observation that all his undertakings against David were unsuccessful, and that David in respect to his persecutions was under special divine protection, coupled with the recollection of what Samuel had once said to him in the name of God respecting his rejection for disobedience. The declaration of his conscience: "Thou art re-

* [On this verse and its translation see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

jected by God" was confirmed by the manifest signs of divine guidance and protection in David's life, and by the imposing moral power of David's conduct. Cler.: "From this great magnanimity of David he concluded that a man who was much superior in soul to kings could not but reign." *Two* things he says: 1) "*Thou wilt become king*," and 2) "in thy hand *the kingdom will be permanently established*," *not* "will be *raised* up, grow, increase" (Gramb.). So far has the dark cloud of envy and hate passed away from Saul's soul, that he not only recognizes and affirms David's future kingship, but to him as future king prefers a request in the form of an *adjuration*, that *he would show royal kindness and mercy to his house and name*. David gave him the promise in an oath that he would not after his death exterminate his posterity, as was often the case in changes of dynasty in the East, and, as Keil well points out, repeatedly occurred also in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes. 1 Kings xv. 28 sq.; xvi. 11 sq.; 2 Kings x. Similar request by Jonathan xx. 15. [*Bib.-Com.:* "The deep genealogical feeling of the Israelites breaks out here as so often elsewhere." Saul's declaration as to David's future kingship is not divine prophecy, but human foresight.—Tr.]—Ver. 23 [22]. The description of the interview, so significant for both parties to it, concludes with the statement that Saul went to his residence, while David with his men went up into the strong and secure mountain-heights. The latter did not return home, because he could not expect that Saul would retain this disposition and essentially change his bearing towards him.—Cler.: "He knew Saul's changeable and perfidious nature, and was afraid of his snares." [Nor, apparently, did Saul invite or expect him to go home. His presence at court would have been embarrassing; his training in the fields is to continue yet some time.—Tr.]

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. This incident of David's life in ch. xxiv. (not xxvi.) forms the basis of Ps. vii. (of which he is the author), which is rich in references to this event and whose title: "Shiggaion of David which he sang to the Lord concerning the words of Cush the Benjaminite," giving the slanderous accusations of this man as the occasion of the Psalm, presents a situation identical with that of ver. 10 [9] of ch. xxiv. There were men who, by all sorts of slanders, blackened David with Saul, and inflamed his hate against him. Among these, according to the title, was the Benjaminite Cush. The Benjaminites, on account of the tribal relationship, were pronounced adherents of Saul, and he had bound them to him by all sorts of favors (comp. xxii. 7). *Cush* is not a symbolical name for a man of black wickedness, namely here for *Saul* (to whose father's name Kish, Hengstenberg and Kimchi see an allusion), but the proper name of a Benjaminite man, one of those slanderers and go-betweens, whose mention in the title of this Psalm (the situation in which accords throughout with that in ch. xxiv.) is a supplement to the allusion in ver. 10. How the content of the Psalm is based on David's assertion of innocence and confident appeal to God which is given here in ch. xxiv. is clear from the train of thought: After the singer's introductory *cry for help*, vers. 2, 3 [1, 2] follows the *affirmation of freedom from revenge and of innocence* as to the accusations made against him (pointing to xxiv. 5–8, 18, 19 [4–7, 17, 18]), vers. 4–6 [3–5]. On this is based (see xxiv. 13–16 [12–15]) *the appeal to the Lord for execution of His judgment*, to which he submits in firm confidence and good conscience, vers. 7–10 [6–9]. To this is added (see xxiv. 16 [15]) *avowal of trust* in the help of the righteous God, and in the self-prepared destruction of the unrighteous, vers. 11–17 [10–16]. In conclusion the vow of *thanksgiving* [ver. 17.]—What Delitzsch excellently says of the *character* of the Psalm: "It is the most solemn pathos of lofty self-consciousness, that here speaks,—anxious unrest, defiant self-trust, triumphant upsoaring, confident trust, prophetic certainty, all these tones find expression in the irregular strophe-sequence of this Davidic dithyramb," all this is found substantially in David's words to Saul.—Hengstenberg's statement of the *didactic content* of the Psalm: "There is a *twofold didactic element* in the Psalm: 1) it is a necessary *condition of divine help* that one lift up *pure hands* to God, and 2) this condition being fulfilled, *the divine righteousness vouches for the absolute certainty of the deliverance*," answers precisely in both points to the two fundamental thoughts of David's address (ch. xxiv.) to Saul: 1) I am innocent, and therefore sure of divine help, and 2) God's justice will bring my innocence to light, and punish my unrighteous persecutors.

2. As *fundamental traits* in the religious-moral *character* of David appear in this section the following: *magnanimous forbearance* towards his enemy providentially given into his hand, decided *repulse of the temptation to revenge* on him, *tenderness of conscience* whereby his heart smote him for appropriating a piece of Saul's garment, frank and bold *affirmation of his innocence* against slanders and persecutions, *reverent piety* towards the sacred person of the Lord's chosen and the *de facto* theocratic king, *the confidence of a good conscience*, and the *patient waiting* of a mind resigned to God's dispensations in respect to the severe sufferings appointed him, and the expected decision of the divine justice, *love of enemies* which not only puts far away revenge, but repays evil with good, firm *confidence in God's justice* (having its root in humility), with which in the consciousness of innocence he appeals to the highest tribunal, clear *knowledge of the ways of the divine justice*, whose aim is *the maintenance of the divinely-appointed holy order of his kingdom* (namely, that the unrighteously introduced evil be punished), and *hope in the saving help of God* founded on faith in God's justice. "That David was magnanimous towards enemies, that, when his foe was through chance in his hands, instead of satiating his vengeance, he sent him reverently away, is wholly in keeping with his nature, and in the song Ps. vii. 5 [4] is referred to by him briefly and incidentally, but clearly enough; that to Saul himself, even when there would have been the most favorable opportunity to inflict grievous injury on him, he could do no bodily harm, follows immediately from the idea itself of the 'Anointed of God' which filled his soul" (Ew., III., 130).

3. The old proverb: "*From the evil comes evil*" (ver. 14 [13] expresses the truth that the moral

character of the man necessarily determines his conduct; the ethical *actus* is always the expression of the ethical *habitus;* the precise nature of the *inner* life, whether in good or in evil, the ethical character of the personality shows itself in the man's *outward* doing. It is the same truth which is expressed in the New Test. declaration: "As the tree so the fruit" (Matt. vii. 17).

4. The simple self-presentation and self-witness of moral purity and truth (as here in David in word and deed) has a great missionary power, and often makes a mighty impression on spiritually darkened and morally perverted natures (as Saul's here) in such wise that the divine in them is freed from the binding power of the evil, and the religious-moral element of the conscience, which is concealed deep under religious-moral corruption, breaks freely forth, at least in some bright and good moments, in order to point to the way of salvation and show the possibility of deliverance, provided the man *is willing* to be saved and renewed.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 3 [2]. S. SCHMID: How much it were to be wished that the pious would apply as much diligence to the practice of good as the ungodly do to the practice of evil (Rom. vi. 19).—Ver. 5 [4]. WUERT. BIB.: It happens quite often that men seek to mislead us by an apparent application of the Word of God; let us therefore prove all things and hold fast that which is good (Matt. iv. 6). [HALL: Those temptations are most powerful which fetch their force from the pretence of a religious obedience.—TR.]—Vers. 6, 7 [5, 6]. CRAMER: It is a praiseworthy virtue to be able to conquer one's self, and he that ruleth his spirit is better than he that taketh a city (Prov. xvi. 32).—SCHLIER: David really gained a greater victory at this moment than formerly in the fight against Goliath.—Let us be master over ourselves, let us fight against our anger and overcome the enemy in our own heart. It is a wonderful, every way instructive and shame-inspiring sight, the fugitive David protecting his deadly foe against the hand of his friends. [CHRYSOSTOM remarks that David had reason to fear lest his men should rebel and do violence to him if he spared their common enemy; also that they were very cunning in not suggesting revenge—to which they knew David would not incline—but the pious recognition of God's hand.—TAYLOR: No doubt it might be said that God had rejected Saul, and had caused David to be anointed in his room; but that had not given to David the right to deal summarily with Saul; it had only indicated that when, in the course of Providence, Saul should be removed, David would be set upon his throne. For this, therefore, David would wait. He would not take Providence into his own hands. He would bide God's time, and it should not be said for him that he had come into the kingdom by the assassination of his predecessor. Even his cutting off a portion of Saul's robe caused him some misgivings of heart, the rather as perhaps after he had done it, his men, emboldened by his example, might have felt themselves at liberty to go farther, and lay hands on the king himself. If any such disposition was manifested by them, it was immediately repressed by their leader.—TR.]—HALL: Tender consciences are moved to regret at those actions, which strong hearts pass over with a careless ease.—Ver. 8 [7]. SCHMID: What one cannot himself do with a good conscience, he must also not permit those to do whom he has to command. [This holds good only within certain limits.—TR.]—STARKE: We must not yield even to our dearest and best friends when they desire from us something wrong.—Ver. 9 [8]. SCHLIER: How instructive is this union of reverence with genuine manly spirit! It is a servant of the Lord who speaks—a servant of the Lord filled with fear of God.—Modesty and respect are becoming to a Christian in all cases. But that does not exclude us from also telling the truth, with all modesty, to be sure, but yet with all candor.—Ver. 10 [9]. OSIANDER: One must not lay his hand on even an ungodly ruler.—Ver. 12 [11]. S. SCHMID: That is the highest love towards God and one's neighbor, when any one restrains himself from revenge in such a manner that he returns his enemy good for the highest wrong (Rom. xii. 21).—BERL. BIB.: As men are, so are their actions. As the tree, so is the fruit. What the heart is full of, the mouth runs over with and the hands work at and accomplish. Ver. 16 [15]. OSIANDER: God is advocate, judge, avenger and protector for those who suffer for righteousness' sake.—Ver. 17 [16]. STARKE: A good word finds a good reception often even with the most corrupt men.—Ver. 18 [17]. BERLENBURG. BIBLE: See how David's patience works upon Saul, and how one may heap coals of fire upon the heads of his enemies (Prov. xxv. 22). Try this means on thy unfriendly and perverse neighbor or relative (Rom. xii. 20). — Ver. 20 [19]. CRAMER: A mighty thing is the truth. Therefore, if thy brother sins against thee, go and rebuke him between thee and him alone (Matt. xviii. 15).—S. SCHMID: The ungodly, too, must at last confess that it is right for God to requite the righteous according to their righteousness. — Vers. 21-23 [20-22]. CRAMER: To be able to constrain and win an enemy with good words, gentleness and modesty, is the noblest victory (Prov. xv. 1).—OSIANDER: Enemies are often overcome much sooner by good deeds than by force.—S. SCHMID: What God has according to His wise counsel designed for His pious and upright servants, must become theirs, although the ungodly with all their powers set themselves against it and begrudge it to them; yea, at last the ungodly must themselves confess that their efforts against it are in vain.—SCHLIER: How often we think, too, as soon as good thoughts and feelings stir in us, that already it is all done; how often we think with a couple of good purposes and resolutions to get to the end! O believe it though: before all things there must be a change towards the living God, before all things must we bow before God, before all things confess our sins to Him; the first thing and the most necessary of all is repentance! That is the only way there can be a real and thorough change. (See above "Hist. and Theolog.")

[Ver. 4. *Providential purpose, apparent and real.* 1) What was here the apparent purpose of God? To give an injured man opportunity for delivering and avenging himself. He was strongly tempted: *a*) It was indeed a "special providence"

of an extraordinary and very striking kind (comp. v. 10). *b*) He had been cruelly wronged, by friend (xxiii. 12) and foe, and there seemed no other hope of deliverance from this perpetual persecution. *c*) His followers insisted on his embracing the tempting opportunity, and might rebel if he refused. 2) How did he know that such could not be the purpose of Providence? Because it would involve his doing what was *wrong in itself* (vers. 5, 6, 10). An enlightened and tender conscience must check our interpretations of Providence. 3) What was the real Providential purpose? As usual, it was manifold: we can see the following points: *a*) To make him more conscientious by obeying conscience under sore temptation (vers. 5, 6). *b*) To present a noble example to his rude followers and the people at large (vers. 6, 10). *c*) To furnish a most convincing proof that he was wrongly accused (vers. 9–11). *d*) To give him ground for a confident appeal to Providence in future (ver. 12 sq.; comp. xxvi. 23–4). *e*) To heighten his reputation for loyalty and magnanimity, and smooth the way to his finally becoming king (comp. ver. 20).

[Vers. 1–15. *David's magnanimity.* (Group homiletically the materials indicated in "Hist. and Theol.," No. 2.)

[Ver. 13. *A Bible proverb before Solomon:* 1) Habitual bad conduct proves bad character. 2) Habitual good conduct, notwithstanding tempting occasions for wickedness, proves that the character is not bad. 3) It is well when one can appeal to his actions as supporting his words and proving the purity of his motives.

[Vers. 9–15. *A good man defending himself against suspicion and slander:* 1) He remonstrates against listening to slanderous accusers (ver. 9). 2) He sets forth his actions as showing that the charges are false (vers. 10, 11, 13). 3) He declares the persecution of him to be utterly unbecoming in a person of high position (ver. 14). 4) He solemnly appeals to God: *a*) to plead his cause, *b*) to deliver him, *c*) to punish his persecutor, which he will not himself do (vers. 12, 15; comp. Psa. vii.).

Vers. 16–22. *Temporary amendment in a fallen man:* 1) Its occasion—an exhibition of magnanimous kindness touches his better feelings. 2) Its signs. *a*) Bitter weeping. *b*) Frank confession (ver. 17). *c*) Prayer that a man he has been wronging may be blessed of God (ver. 19). *d*) Acknowledgment that this man is not only better than himself, but has a righteous cause (ver. 20). *e*) Abandonment of his attempts to wrong the other. 3) Why the amendment proves only temporary: *a*) It is only matter of *feeling*, not of principle (ver. 16). *b*) He is thinking more of his *own interests* than of justice to another (ver. 21). *c*) He *does not* really *return to God*, but only softens towards a man. *d*) Sooner or later comes a *fresh temptation* (xxvi. 1 sq.).—Tr.]

VII. *Samuel's death. David's march into the wilderness of Paran. The history of the foolish Nabal and the wise Abigail.*

Chapter XXV. 1–44.

1 And Samuel died; and all the Israelites [Israel] were gathered together, and
lamented him and buried him in his house at Ramah. And David arose and went
down[1] to the wilderness of Paran.[2]
2 And there was a man in Maon, whose possessions were in Carmel. And the man
was very great, and he had three thousand sheep, and a thousand goats; and he
3 was shearing[3] his sheep in Carmel. Now [And] the name of the man was Nabal,
and the name of his wife Abigail; and she was a woman [the woman was] of good

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. Some MSS. have simply "went," יֵלֶךְ instead of יֵרֶד.—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 1. This reading is well defended by Erdmann against the Sept. "Maon" which is preferred by Wellh. and Bib. Comm.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 2. Eng. A. V. here follows the Vulg., *factum est ut tonderetur grex eius.* But the exacter rendering seems to be: "and he was, when he was shearing his sheep, in Carmel" (so Cahen, Philippson, and apparently Sept.). On the other hand the Syr. takes וַיְהִי in the sense: "and it came to pass," the rest of the clause being the Relative protasis, vers. 3, 4 parenthesis, and ver. 5 the apodosis: "and it came to pass, when he was shearing, *etc.*, (and the name . . . his sheep), that David sent, *etc.*" This construction is adopted by Then., Erdmann, and in part (ver. 3) by Cahen. To this Wellh. properly objects that ver. 2 is closely connected with ver. 3, and ver. 4 with ver. 5, and that the proposed construction would require the suffix ו to בִּגְזֹז. The Heb. text (simple Inf.) is confirmed by Sept. and Chald. and perhaps by Syr. (Partcp. without following Pron.), and it is to be noticed that the Greek has ἐγενήθη (as in ver. 20) and not ἐγένετο, which is the usual rendering of the pleonastic or anticipatory וַיְהִי (as in vers. 37, 38). Statements, more naturally conceived by us as parenthetic, are frequently put in Heb. in the form of continuous narration.—Tr.]

understanding and of a beautiful countenance; but the man was churlish and evil
4 in his doings; and he was of the house of Caleb.[4] And David heard in the wilder-
5 ness that Nabal did shear his sheep. And David sent out [*om.* out] ten young men,
and David said unto the young men, Get you up to Carmel and go to Nabal and
6 greet[5] him in my name. And thus shall ye say to him that liveth[6] *in prosperity*
[*om.* that liveth in prosperity], Peace be both [*om.* both[7]] to thee, and peace be to
7 thy house, and peace be unto all that thou hast. And now I have heard that thou
hast shearers.[8] Now thy shepherds which [*om.* which] were with us; we hurt[9] them
not, neither was there aught missing unto them all the while they were in Carmel.
8 Ask thy young men and they will show [tell] thee. Wherefore let the young men
find favor in thine eyes, for we come in a good day; give, I pray thee, whatsoever
9 [what] cometh to thine hand unto thy servants[10] and to thy son David. And when
[*om.* when] David's young men[11] came they [and] spake to Nabal according to all
10 those words in the name of David, and ceased.[12] And Nabal answered David's ser-
vants and said, Who is David? and who is the son of Jesse? there be [are] many
11 servants[13] nowadays that break away every man from his master. Shall I then
take my bread and my water and my flesh [meat] that I have killed for my shear-
12 ers, and give it unto men whom I know not whence they be? So [And] David's
young men turned [*ins.* to] their way, and went again [returned] and came and told
13 him [*ins.* according to[14]] all those sayings. And David said unto his men, Gird ye
on every man his sword. And they girded on every man his sword, and David
also girded on his sword. And there went up after David about four hundred men,
and two hundred abode by the stuff.
14 But [And] one of the young men told Abigail, Nabal's wife, saying, Behold, Da-
vid sent messengers out of [from] the wilderness to salute our master; and he railed[15]
15 on them. But [And] the men were very good unto us, and we were not hurt, nei-
ther missed we anything, as long as we were conversant with them, when we were
16 in the fields [field]. They were a wall unto us both by night and day all the while
17 we were with them keeping sheep. Now therefore [And now] know and consider
what thou wilt do, for evil is determined against our master and against all his
household, for he is such a son of Belial [bad man] that *a man* [one] cannot speak
to him.[16]
18 Then [And] Abigail made haste, and took two hundred loaves and two bottles
[skins] of wine and five sheep ready dressed and five measures [seahs] of parched

[4] [Ver. 3. So the Qeri. The Kethib or text is discussed by Erdmann in Expos.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 5. Literally: "ask him as to peace." On the pointing of שְׁאָלְתֶּם see Ges. *Gr.*, § 44, 2 Rem. 2.—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 6. לֶחָי. In the impossibility of determining the form and sense of this word it seems better to omit the certainly wrong rendering of Eng. A. V. (though it is adopted by Philippson), especially as the word, whatever its meaning, cannot affect the general sense of the clause. See Erdm. in Expos.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 6. This "both" is intended as translation of וְ, but this letter must be stricken out, or, possibly, attached to preceding word (*Bib. Com.*).—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 7. So the Heb. and the VSS., except Sept. which reads: "that thy shepherds are now shearing for thee," connecting the following הָרֹ׳ with the Partcp., which the connection does not allow. Yet the Heb. phrase sounds curt and strange. We should expect "thou art shearing," or, "they are shearing for thee."—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 7. The Seghol of the ה is a neighboring form to Chireq, both being degradations (the latter more advanced) of the original Pattach.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 8. Sing. in some MSS. and Edd., "thy servant, namely, thy son, David," perhaps from failure to see the application to David's young men. Sept. omits the word.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 9. Some MSS. read עַבְדֵי "servants," indicating a certain vacillation in the use of these synonyms.—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 9. Erdmann: "sat down," Chald., Vulg., Philippson, Cahen, Wellhausen as Eng. A. V., Bib. Comm.: "rested." Syr. eludes the difficulty (as it often does) by omitting the word. For various text-words which Sept. (ἀνεπήδησε) may have had before it see Schleusner *s. v.* If we retain the Heb., the rendering of Eng. A. V. is as good as any other; for the impression made on us is that Nabal's answer followed immediately on the delivery of the message (so that there was no occasion to rest), and, if a considerable time (as a night) had intervened between message and answer, it would probably have been mentioned. Yet the passage is not satisfactory; we do not expect to be informed here that David's messengers ceased when they had said their say, or sat down to rest; we should rather look for some intimation of churlish bearing on Nabal's part, which, however, cannot well be found (even by changing our word) in the present form of the Heb. text.—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 10. Wellh. inserts the Art. before ע׳, yet Heb. (perhaps the conversational language particularly) allowed latitude in this respect.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 12. So Heb., Chald., Sept. and Erdmann (*gleich*); the כ is omitted by Syr., Arab. and Vulg. which last Eng. A. V. probably follows.—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 14. Or, "flew on them." See the Exposition. Chald. and Syr. "was disgusted with them" (from קוץ or קוט).—Tr.]

[16] [Ver. 17. The rendering of the Syr. is strange: "he was with the shepherds." Is this a copyist's erroneous repetition of the end of the preceding verse?

corn and an hundred clusters of raisins and two hundred cakes of figs and laid them
19 on [*ins.* the] asses, And she [*om.* she] said unto her servants [young men], Go on
before me; behold, I come after you. But [And] she told not her husband Nabal.
20 And it was *so*, as she rode [And she was riding] on the ass that she came down by
[and descending into] the covert of the hill [mountain], and behold, David and his
21 men came down [were coming down] against her, and she met them. Now [And]
David had said, Surely in vain have I kept all that this fellow hath in the wilder-
ness, so that nothing was missed[17] of all that pertained unto him, and he hath re-
22 quited me evil for good. So and more also do God unto the enemies of [*om.* the
enemies of[18]] David if I leave of all that pertain to him by the morning light[19] any
that pisseth against the wall [any male].
23 And when Abigail saw David, she hasted, and lighted off the ass, and fell before
24 David on her face, and bowed herself to the ground,[20] And fell at his feet,[21] and
said, Upon me, my lord, upon me let *this* iniquity be [On me, even me, my lord, be
the sin], and let thine handmaid, I pray thee, speak in thine audience, and hear the
25 words of thine handmaid. Let not my lord, I pray thee [*om.* thee], regard this
man of Belial [this bad man], *even* [*om.* even] Nabal. For, as his name is, so is he;
Nabal is his name and folly[22] is with him. But I, thine handmaid, saw not the
26 young men of my lord whom thou didst send. Now, therefore [And now], my lord,
as the Lord [Jehovah] liveth and as thy soul liveth, seeing [*om.* seeing] the Lord
[Jehovah] hath withholden thee from coming *to shed* blood [into blood-guiltiness]
and from[23] avenging [saving] thyself with thine own hand. [*ins.* And] now, let
27 thine enemies and they that seek evil to my lord be as Nabal. And now, this bless-
ing which thine handmaid hath brought[24] unto my lord, let it even [*om.* even] be
28 given unto the young men that follow my lord. I pray thee, forgive [Forgive, I
pray thee] the trespass of thine handmaid; for the Lord [Jehovah] will certainly
make my lord a sure house, because my lord fighteth the battles of the Lord [Je-
29 hovah], and evil hath not been [shall not be] found in thee all thy days. Yet
[And] a man is risen[25] to pursue thee, and to seek thy soul [life]; but [and] the
soul [life] of my lord shall be bound in the bundle of life with the Lord [Jehovah]
thy God, and the souls [life] of thine enemies, them [it] shall he sling out *as out* of
30 the middle [sling out in the pan[26]] of a [the] sling. And it shall come to pass,
when the Lord [Jehovah] shall have done [shall do] to my lord according to all the
good that he hath spoken concerning thee, and shall have appointed [shall appoint]
31 thee ruler over Israel, That this shall be no grief[27] unto thee nor offence of heart
unto my lord, either [*om.* either[28]] that thou hast shed blood causeless [causelessly]

[17] [Ver. 21. Sept. ("we prescribed not") and Theodotion ("we demanded not") take this wrongly as 1 plu. Impf. (in the Coislin. it is Sing.), where Symmachus has διεφώνησεν in the sense of "perished" (see Schleusner), Vulg. *periit*.—Tr.]

[18] [Ver. 22. The sense of the common formula requires the omission of this phrase, for the insertion of which there is no good reason here. It is not improbable, as Wellhausen suggests, that it was added by a copyist who saw that in fact David had not carried out his scheme of destruction, and would thus avert the imprecation from his head to that of his enemies. But such an imprecation is always to be considered as resting on two conditions: 1) if it be wrong, it must be withdrawn, and 2) if its occasion be removed, it is null and void.—Tr.]

[19] [Ver. 22. The word "light" (אוֹר) is omitted in Sept., Syr., Vulg., and in many MSS. and Edd.; it was perhaps introduced by a copyist from ver. 34.—Tr.]

[20] [Ver. 23. We should here expect אָרְצָה as one MS. has it.—Tr.]

[21] [Ver. 24. In this description of Abigail's demeanor (vers. 23, 24) the עַל "on" before רַגְלָיו and the two prostrations are somewhat difficult. The difficulty is removed by the Sept. which omits the second "fell" (ver. 24). But here we should probably maintain the harder reading, and it is likely that Abigail's anxiety and trepidation made her movement somewhat elaborate and complicated.—Tr.]

[22] [Ver. 25. Aquila: ἀπόῤῥευσις (see Ges., Thes. on נָבֵל), on which says Schol. (in Schleusner): Ἀκύλας ἡρμήνευσεν ἀπόῤῥευσις μετ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ γὰρ λογισμοῦ ὑποῤῥέοντός τε καὶ σβεννυμένου, τὸ τῆς ἀφροσύνης γίνεται πάθος.—Tr.]

[23] [Ver. 26. We here expect the מִ to be repeated before the Inf.—Tr.]

[24] [Ver. 27. The fem. form (see ver. 35) is found in some MSS. and Edd., and in some is given as Qeri.—Tr.]

[25] [Ver. 29. Erdmann: "should a man arise." Sept. has the Fut. The rendering of Eng. A. V. seems to suit the connection better.—Erdmann: "the bundle of the living," which is the same in general meaning with Eng. A. V.—Tr.]

[26] [Ver. 29. So the Heb., Sept. and Syr. The general meaning is clear, but the VSS. vary in the rendering. Chald: "As those who sling stones in a sling." Vulg.: *inimicorum tuorum anima rotabitur quasi in impetu et circulo fundæ*. The Heb. is difficult, but perhaps for that reason better retained.—Tr.]

[27] [Ver. 31. Commonly now rendered "stumbling-block."—Wellh. would regard לֵב as clerical repetition of לְךָ and לַאדֹנִי as courtly correction of the latter, and would omit these two words. This would give the simple rendering: "This will not be to thee an offence and a stumbling-block" (Sept. σκάνδαλον), and get rid of the apparently cumbrous "to my lord." Yet here again simplifying corrections are suspicious.—Tr.]

or [and] that my lord hath avenged himself [hath saved himself with his own hand].
But [And] when the Lord [Jehovah] shall have dealt [shall deal] well with my
lord, then remember thine handmaid.[29]
32 And David said to Abigail, Blessed be the Lord [Jehovah] God of Israel, which
33 [who] sent thee this day to meet me; And blessed be thy advice [understanding[30]],
and blessed be thou, which [who] hast kept me this day from coming to shed blood
34 [into blood-guiltiness] and from avenging [saving] myself with my own hand. For
[And] in very deed, as the Lord [Jehovah], God of Israel liveth, which [who] hath
kept me back from hurting thee, except thou hadst hasted and come to meet me,
surely [*om.* surely] there had not been left unto Nabal by the morning-light any
35 that pisseth against the wall [any male]. So [And] David received of her hand
that which she had brought him, and said unto her, Go up in peace to thine house;
see, I have hearkened to thy voice, and have accepted thy person.
36 And Abigail came to Nabal. And behold, he held a feast in his house like the
feast of a king; and Nabal's heart was merry within him, for [and] he was very
37 drunken, wherefore she told him nothing, less or more, until the morning light. But
[And] it came to pass in the morning, when the wine was gone out of Nabal, and
[that] his wife had [*om.* had] told him[31] these things, that [and] his heart died
38 within him and he became *as* a stone. And it came to pass about ten days[32] after,
39 that the Lord [Jehovah] smote Nabal that [and] he died. And when [*om.* when]
David heard that Nabal was dead [*ins.* and] he said, Blessed be the Lord [Jehovah] that hath pleaded the cause of my reproach from the hand of Nabal, and hath
kept his servant from evil, for [and] the Lord [Jehovah] hath returned the wickedness of Nabal upon his own head. And David sent and communed with Abigail
40 to take her to him to wife. And when [*om.* when] the servants of David were come
[came] to Abigail to Carmel they [and] spake unto her saying, David sent us unto
41 thee to take thee to him to wife. And she arose and bowed herself on her face to
the earth, and said, Behold, let thy handmaid be [thy handmaid is] a servant to
42 wash the feet of the servants of my lord. And Abigail hasted and arose and rode
upon an [the] ass with five damsels of hers that[33] went after her, and she went after
the messengers of David and became his wife.
43 David also [And David] took Ahinoam of Jezreel; and they were also both of
44 them his wives. But Saul had given [And Saul gave] Michal his daughter, David's wife to Phalti the son of Laish, which [who] was of Gallim.

28 [Ver. 31. The "either" is translation of ו, which is better stricken out.—The construction seems to require us to supply "his hand" (ידו) as in vers. 26, 33).—Tr.]

29 [Ver. 31. The Sept. adds flatly and indelicately "to do good to her."—Tr.]

30 [Ver. 33. Thy "good sense, discretion."—Tr.]

31 [Ver. 37. The Arab. VS. and some MSS. insert "all" (כֹּל).—Tr.]

32 [Ver. 38. Wellh. rejects the Art. as the time is not defined, but the Heb. allows in such cases definiteness of statement.—Tr.]

33 [Ver. 42. The Partcp. has the Art., and so we render better: "the five, *etc.*, that went." Sept. omits the Art., which may be a repetition from the preceding ה; but the Heb. gives a good sense. The Partcp. is not necessarily predicate, but may be subject along with "Abigail."—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. *Brief account of Samuel's death.*—**And Samuel died.**—The narrator supposed Samuel's death to fall in the time of the events here related. —**All Israel mourned him**, not merely because his career as judge and leader up to the time of the establishment of the kingdom was fresh in the memory of the people, but because his political work as prophet and watcher over the kingdom had remained to the end of profound importance for the whole people, as is clear from his relation to Saul and David on the one hand, and his position as head of the prophetic community, on the other. At his burial the people were no doubt represented by their elders. As to such mourning for the dead see Gen. l. 10.—**And buried him in his house at Ramah.**—Not literally: "in his house,"—this "would not have accorded (Lev. xix. 16) with the Jewish purification laws" (Then.),—but in some space, *court* or garden (Matt. xxvii. 60) belonging to the house. Grot.: "Sepulchres were then usually private, see Gen. xxiii. 9; l. 5." On such interments "in the house," comp. 1 Kings ii. 34; 2 Kings xxi. 18; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 20. Tradition puts the burial-place of Samuel on the height of Mizpah, where it is yet shown. The harmonization of this statement with our passage by regarding Ramah as a region (Pressel, s. v. "Ramah" in Herzog) is untrustworthy by reason of the untenableness of this geographical and topographical supposition and the distance of Mizpah from the city Ramah (comp. Nägelsbach in Herz. XIII. 399). In *Ramah*—"for the

prophets seem, though we infer it only from this passage and xxviii. 3, to have shared with the kings the right of burial within the city" (Thenius).*

Ver. 2 sq. *David's affair with the rich landholder and herd-owner Nabal of Maon*, after he had gone *down* from his hitherto abode in the highland of *Engedi* farther south and into the wilderness of *Paran*. The Sept. (Vat.) has *Maon* instead of Paran, and this is taken as the original reading by Then., Ew., Bunsen, because the wilderness of Paran would be too far off (at least fifteen geographical miles) from Nabal's residence (Thenius). But this supposition is "certainly unnecessary" (Win. *s. v.* 193, Rem. 1); for David, descending southward, withdrew into the northernmost part of this somewhat undefined wilderness, "which extended widely between the wilderness of Shur on the west, the present Jebel et-Tih on the south, the Edomite territory on the east, and the land of Canaan on the north" (Winer).† Cler.: "the boundaries of this desert are not clearly defined." Comp. Keil on Num. x. 12. Probably the wilderness of Judah no longer afforded sustenance to David and his large body of six hundred men (Keil). *Nabal* is called a *man of Maon* because he dwelt in this city in the hill-country of Judah (Josh. xv. 55). His business (see Ex. xxiii. 6) on the contrary was in *Carmel*, where Saul had raised his monument of victory over the Amalekites, whence also came his wife Abigail, "the Carmelitess" (xxvii. 3). It is the present *Kurmul* on the elevated plain of the highland of Judah, about a mile north of Maon [and ten miles south-east of Hebron.—Tr.]. It is thence easily understood how Nabal, living in the mountain-city Maon, had his herds on the high plain in Carmel. Thenius understands *mount* Carmel [in the north], because a mountain is spoken of in vers. 5, 7, 8, 13, 20, 35, and because it is said that Nabal had his *possessions*, his herds, on Carmel, and the mountain-meadow would be specially wholesome for the sheep and goats. But, as to height, the place Carmel lay on a mountain-plain, which afforded the best pasture for the herds. Moreover, the distance of Mount Carmel from the scene of this history [nearly one hundred miles north-west.—Tr.] would exclude it. Maon, Carmel, Ziph, are named together in Josh. xv. 55. Nabal's claim to the title of "very great," that is, rich man, is proved by the size of his herds ("three thousand sheep and one thousand goats").—Sheep-shearing was usually accompanied by festivities, as now also on great estates. While the rich man was shearing at Carmel, David sent to him; the protasis begins with "and it came to pass, in the shearing" (וַיְהִי בִּגְזֹז), vers. 3, 4, is explanatory parenthesis, and the apodosis begins with ver. 5 (Then.).‡ The statements of the names, Nabal, Abigail, and the descriptions of the persons are arranged chiastically: The *woman good* of understanding (sensible, wise) and *beautiful of form*—the *man*, on the contrary, hard, churlish of *disposition* and wicked in *conduct*. As to the last word of the verse, the Kethib or text (כְּלִבּוֹ) "according to his heart" would mean "following only the desire of his mind" (Maur.), that is, self-willed—which is, however, "linguistically impossible" (Buns.). The Qeri or marginal reading (כָּלִבִּי), "found also in some manuscripts and printed editions in the text" (Then.), is, with Targum and Vulgate, certainly preferable: "he was of the family of *Caleb*." The two former statements sufficiently characterize his disposition; a third would be out of keeping with the simplicity of the description. On the other hand, the statement of his origin accords with his importance as a man "great" by his riches, and it is introduced as something new by the words "and he" (וְהוּא), which would not suit the continuation of the moral portraiture. Caleb had received for a possession the region of Hebron, near which Maon and Carmel lay (Josh. xv. 13 sq.). Comp. ch. xxx. 14: the southland of Caleb, a region in the south of Judah. The translation of the Sept., "a doggish, cynical man" (so Arab. and Syr.) and of Josephus leading a cynical life" (from כֶּלֶב a dog") must be rejected. [So Boothroyd: "irritable as a dog" (Philipps.)—Tr.].—Ver. 4. As Nabal was a man rich in herds, it was worth while to send an embassy to him from some distance for the purpose indicated in the context. The distance would indeed be great and improbable, if with Thenius we took Carmel to be the mountain of that name. The stately number *ten* of the messengers shows the importance and solemnity of the embassy; such a solemn sending would not suit the proximity of "Maon," David's abode according to the reading of the Sept. In *Carmel* Nabal had a house (vers. 35, 36). The Sept. adds to Nabal: "the Carmelite," taking the designation from xxx. 5, where it belongs to Abigail. **Ask in my name after his peace**, give him friendly greeting. Comp. Ex. xviii. 7.—Ver. 6. Here the content and form of the greeting is exactly prescribed. First, the general wish: לֶחָי [Eng. A. V.: "to him that liveth (in prosperity")]. The translation "to my brothers" (לְאַחַי, Vulg.), is impossible by reason of the following "thou;" it could only be "my brother" = "friend," but it is an arbitrary conjecture. Some take the word (חָי) as adjective ["living," so Eng. A. V.—Tr.]. Clericus joins it to the preceding "say" and renders: "to the living (say), if ye find him alive," S. Schmid: "and thus shall ye say: to the living (that is, the living God) I commend thee." But the first (Clericus) is superfluous, since in sending the messengers, David assumed that Nabal *still lived*; the latter (Schmid) is untenable because of the arbitrariness of the reference to God. Böttcher connects it with the "say," and takes the Sing. (חָי) in the sense of "man" (as one possessing vigorous life), adducing the use of the Plu. (חַיִּים) and the Collective-form (חַיָּה) in the sense of "*people*," as in xviii. 18; Num. xxxv. 8; 2 Sam. xxiii. 13. The meaning would then

* [*Bib. Com.* compares the death and burial of Moses, Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6, 8.—Tr.]

† [So Mr. Hayman in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, Art. "Paran," who suggests that the skirts of the great wilderness may have passed (without well-fixed dividing lines) under different names, Zin, Maon, *etc.*—Tr.]

‡ [On this construction see "Text. and Gram.," where a different view is taken.—Tr.]

be: "Say to the living one," that is, to the man. But the Sing. is never used in this sense. Against De Wette's earlier rendering: "say to the *well-living*" [so Philippson and Eng. A. V.—Tr.] is the fact that the simple word will not bear this meaning [the addition of "well" or "in prosperity" is unwarranted.—Tr.]. The Sept. has "for this year" (εἰς ὥρας as in Gen. xviii. 10, 14), that is, mayest thou with thy house be in peace till the return of this happy day—a "tolerably far-fetched idea," impossible as a translation of the text, and a mere makeshift to avoid the difficulty.—It is better (considering the difficulties) to take the word as Subst. = "life." It is objected that only the Plu. is so used; but the Sing. is found not only in the formula of swearing "by the life of thy soul, of Jehovah," but also in Lev. xxv. 36 in the signification "*life*." The phrase (לֶחָי), however, can then mean neither "for a long time, for many years" (Vulg. according to another reading, and Jos.), nor "for the life, the whole lifetime, forever" (Chald., D. Kimchi, Dathe); the expression does not allow these renderings, which introduce a foreign idea (long), unless we change the following letter (ו) into the suffix (ךָ) and read "for thy life." But, instead of this bold and unsupported conjecture, it is better to take *life* (De Wette: *zum leben* "unto life") as = "fortune, prosperity," and to regard the expression as a popular form of *congratulation*, not found in the literary language; Luther: "success" (*glück auf*)! Maurer: "to life, that is, may it turn out well; may thy affairs be fortunate" [so Rashi, and apparently Talmud Bab., Berakoth fol. 55, 2.—Tr.]. We cannot admit such a congratulation is superfluous by reason of what follows (Then.), for the threefold *special* "peace" on Nabal, his house and his possessions is the unfolding of the general wish, the latter is the prelude, the former the triple chord. It may be freely rendered "thou shalt live" or "live thou long!" [Bib. Com. prefers to attach the following letter (ו) as suffix and render: "and ye shall say thus about his life," which seems forced and unsatisfactory, though it accounts for the ו, which in its present position is disturbing. Cahen: *ainsi pour la vie!* "thus for life!" which is obscure. Wellhausen sees nothing better than "to my brother." In support of the rendering which Erdmann adopts Gesenius cites the Arabic formula: "may God grant thee life!" The phrase cannot be said to have received a satisfactory explanation.—Tr.]

Ver. 17 sq. After the instruction to greet comes the *direction* how to present his *earnest request* to Nabal. **Now I have heard that thou hast shearers.**—These words correspond precisely to the real life, and can only be rightly understood when we recollect that the regularly recurring sheepshearing was one of the greatest events in the housekeeping of such an establishment. In accordance with the urgency of his request, which is due to his pressing need of sustenance for his men, David's introduction is very circumstantial and is based on a captatio benevolentiæ; he reminds Nabal of the *peaceful association* of his men with Nabal's herdsmen during his stay in the wilderness ("*thy herdsmen were with us*"), of the *forbearance* exercised by his *warriors* towards the unarmed herdsmen ("we did not injure them"—הִכְלַמְנוּ as in Judg. xviii. 7; on the form see Ges. § 53, 3 Rem. 6), and of the *honorable disinterestedness* with which his people had refrained from appropriating the property of others ("nothing was missing to them"). The last words may refer, however, to the *protection* afforded the herdsmen by David's people against the predatory incursions of the neighboring desert-tribes; for such protection against thieving attacks (which came especially from the south) is expressly affirmed in vers. 16, 21. "Thus, even in his outlawry, David showed himself the protector of his people" (Keil). Apart, therefore, from eastern custom, according to which such a request would seem no ways strange, David had a certain right to ask a gift from Nabal's superfluity; he had indirectly no small share in the festal joy of Nabal and his house; "without some part of the superfluity of the inhabitants whom he protected, he could not have maintained himself with his army" (Ewald). And this must modify Stähelin's remark (p. 19), that "this narrative shows that David blackmailed even his own countrymen, regarding himself, like an Arab sheikh, as lord of the desert where he lived." For the rest Robinson remarks II. 429 [Am. ed. I., 498—Tr.] in reference to the permanence of customs in the East: "On such a festive occasion near a town or village, even in our own day an Arab Sheikh of the neighboring desert would hardly fail to put in a word, either in person or by message; and his message, both in form and substance, would be only the transcript of that of David."—In a "*good day*," that is, a festive, happy day; sheep-shearing was conducted like a festival (comp. Gen. xxxviii. 12; 2 Sam. xiii. 23), when feasts were held, strangers entertained, and portions given to the poor. **Give what thy hand finds**, that is, as much as thou canst, **to thy servants and thy son David**, an expression of deepest reverence and devotion, and of the piety of the younger man towards the older, in order that he might share in his paternal goodwill.—Ver. 9. The messengers executed their commission, making the request in David's name. **And they sat down**, so we must translate the Heb. word (וַיָּנוּחוּ), *not* "they waited modestly for an answer" (Buns.), not "they were silent" (Vulg., Grot., De Wette). That they sat down is not a superfluous remark, but serves to complete the description, which is true to the reality in the smallest details. Formal sitting down is part of oriental custom in such visits; it is not necessary, therefore, to refer to their need of rest, though, after so long a journey, they need not have been *weakly* persons (Then.), to require rest. Thenius' change of text so that this shall read "and he arose" (וַיָּקָם after Sept. ἀνεπήδησε "he sprang up") is improbable.

Ver. 10 sq. *The insulting answer* with which Nabal contemptuously rebuffed David's ambassadors. **Who is David? Who is the son of Jesse?**—He knew him well; all the more insulting is this answer, whose meaning is: what do I care for David? what have I to do with him? **There are many servants nowadays that break away every one from his master.**—(The Art. stands here with Partcp., not with

Subst., עֲבָדִים הַ, because the former alone is to be distinctly defined (Maurer)).—To his *impertinent question* Nabal adds a *rude insult* to David's servants, whom he characterizes as good-for-nothing runaways, and also to David himself, to whose relation to Saul he maliciously alludes.—Ver. 11. Nabal speaks out his mean, niggardly mind (וְלָקַחְתִּי, Perf. with ו consec., here expressing future time, Ges. § 126, 6, Rem. 1). The whole sentence is to be taken as a question: **Shall I take?** The *bread and water* represents the necessary sustenance of life. The *flesh* stands for luxuries beyond mere necessaries. Instead of "water" the Sept. has "*wine*" in accordance with its arbitrary way of getting rid of difficulties. In the excitement of his avaricious soul, Nabal declares that he will give David and his men neither necessaries of life nor what he had killed for the feasting of his shearers.—[*Bib. Com.*: The mention of water indicates a country where water was scarce, Josh. xv. 19. Or, "bread and water" may="meat and drink."—Tr.]—Ver. 12. The report of this contemptuous and insulting rebuff.—Ver. 13. David determines to take bloody revenge for the insult and hostile reception. Nabal's wicked response to his friendly and modest overture excites his anger. The following narrative shows that he herein sinned before God, but also how God's wonderful providence saved him from the factual completion of his sin.

Vers. 14–22. *Abigail, Nabal's wife, goes to David.*—Vers. 14–17. One of Nabal's servants informs Abigail of what has occurred; he relates Nabal's bearing towards David's greeting (ver. 14), describes the friendly protection they had had from David's people (vers. 15, 16), asks Abigail's counsel and help in respect to the danger that threatened her husband and his whole household, and excuses himself for applying to her by referring to Nabal's bad character and inaccessibility to well-meant representations and requests.

Ver. 14. **A lad of the lads.**—The word "lad" (נַעַר), which is wanting in Sept. and Vulg. [which render, as Eng. A. V., "one of the lads." —Tr.], *is* indeed a rounding of the phrase, but is not, for this reason, and because these translations have properly declined to transfer the phrase literally, to be regarded as the error of a copyist (Then.). בָּרֵךְ [lit. "to bless."—Tr.]= "to congratulate, greet," comp. xiii. 10.—**And he drove over them,** that is, as above described, with insulting, angry *words*.—[Eng. A. V. "railed on them," better "flew on them."—Tr.] See on xiv. 32, xv. 19.*—Ver. 15 is the confirmation of the words of ver. 8: "ask thy young men, and they will tell thee." The testimony of these youths to the friendly and helpful conduct of David's men agrees exactly with what David told his messengers to say, ver. 7. On the phrase: "all the days of our walking with them" (כָּל־יְמֵי הִ, Eng. A. V.: "conversant with them"), it is to be remarked, that sometimes, as here, substantives of time, place or manner stand in construct relation to a *whole sentence* (Ew., § 286, 3, 1).—The words: "while we were in the field" (Vulg., Syr., Arab.: "in the wilderness"), are not to be connected with the following (Sept., Syr., Then.), making "they were a wall to us" [ver. 16] the apodosis, because then in the words: "as long as we were with them keeping the flocks," there would be a second indication of time in the same sentence (comp. Zech. ii. 5).—Ver. 16. **A wall,** that is, a powerful protection against the wild beasts and the attacks of robbers from the Arabian desert.—Ver. 17. "Is determined" (כָּלְתָה), "is a thing settled," as in xx. 9. It is not *necessary* on account of the "and he" (וְהוּא), which refers not to David, but to Nabal, to insert with the Sept. "thou" (אַתְּ) after "consider" (רְאִי), as Thenius insists, for such a contrast is not demanded. Nabal is described as a "bad man" [so should Eng. A. V. read instead of "son of Belial."—Tr.], see on i. 16; xxx. 22; 2 Sam. ii. 12; 1 Kings xxi. 10. "So that one cannot speak" (מִדַּבֵּר="from speaking"), or "he is too wicked for one to be able to speak to him." This is the confidential expression of the estimation in which Nabal was held by his household and servants, comp. ver. 3.

Ver. 18 sq. To avert the impending danger, Abigail, on the representation and at the request of the faithful servant, sets out to go to David without her husband's knowledge, with a rich present of various articles of food. They carried two hundred loaves of bread, two skins, not jars (De Wette), five prepared sheep, of parched corn (קָלִי, xvii. 17=by-meat) five seahs=one and two-thirds ephahs (Then.). Sept. has five ephahs instead of five seahs, thinking the latter too little for so many people [the seah about one and a half pecks, ephah=about four and a half pecks.—Tr.]; but it would not be too little as entremets. We need not, therefore, with Ewald read five hundred seahs.—[Abigail's present was intended not to supply David's army, but to show her good-will.—Tr.]; one hundred cakes of dried grapes (צִמֻּ׳), two hundred cakes of pressed figs (דְּבֵ׳).—Ver. 19. Her journey is described in the minutest particulars; she sends the servants on before with the present, herself following, riding on an ass, in order the better to superintend the movement.—Ver. 20. Her meeting with David. **In the covert,** a hidden place in the mountain. It was "probably a depression between two peaks of a mountain" (Keil), so that David's march, in the main upward, was here downward, and he encountered Abigail's train, which was also moving downward.—[Wellhausen's objection to this explanation as topographically taking too much for granted, seems unfounded, and there is

* Instead of וַיָּעַט Thenius proposes to read וַיָּקָט because several VSS. so render, Sept. ἐξέκλινεν απ' αὐτῶν, Sym. ἀπεστράφη, Vulg. *aversatus est eos*; but this is unsafe, for 1) to the phrase: "he was disgusted with them," we must then give the sense: "he treated them with contempt" (Then.), which the substituted verb does not permit, and 2) it is tolerably clear that these VSS. read wrongly וַיֵּט from נָטָה in the transitive sense: "to turn one's self"—"thrust out of the way," Job xxiv. 4; comp. Am. ii. 7, "lead aside," 2 Sam. iii. 27, "repulse," Psalm xxvii. 9.

no need for taking the verb (ירד) in the general sense of "pursuing one's way."—Tr.]—Vers. 21, 22. A parenthetical explanation of David's feeling and motive in making this movement. אָמַר ="had said."—**Only to deception** [Eng. A. V. "surely in vain"], that is, only to be deceived in my just expectations, **have I kept**, *etc.* (comp. ver. 16), **so that nothing was missed**, he is indebted to me for the undiminished possession of his herds. David had a right to expect grateful requital from Nabal, instead of which Nabal returned him evil for good.—Ver. 22. Oath of vengeance. In this formula ["God do so to me and more also," *etc.*], the divine punishment is commonly invoked on the swearer: "God punish me if," *etc.* (comp. xiv. 44; xx. 13). In some cases it is invoked on the person addressed, as in iii. 17.—[But there it is for *failure in the person addressed*, and, in general, the curse is invoked on the person failing to do something mentioned.—Tr.]—But here the curse is directed against persons not present; the sense is: God shall punish David's enemies, if I take not this vengeance on them; so surely as God will not let this evil go unpunished, will I, *etc.* Instead of "enemies" (לְאֹיְבֵי) Then. reads, after Syr. and Arab.: "his servant" (לְעַבְדּוֹ); but these versions have evidently substituted this reading to avoid the difficulty of the text.—[In spite of the support of Vulg. and Chald. (and indirectly of Syr. and Arab.), the word "enemies" must be omitted with Sept., being here meaningless and disturbing, and the curse must be considered as invoked on David's own head. Erdmann's defence of the text is far-fetched and unavailing. See "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]—*Mingentem ad parietem*, that is, "every male." Bähr on 1 Kings xiv. 10: "The expression may have been taken originally from dogs, and it is certainly not an honorable designation of the male sex, being used everywhere (1 Kings xvi. 11; xxi. 21; 2 Kings ix. 8) of those who are cast out and exterminated."—[See Ges., *Thes. s. v.* שִׁין, where the authorities are quoted, and decision given for the meaning "male person," and not "mean, insignificant male."—Tr.]—David swears to root out Nabal and all the males of his house in revenge for the insult to his person, which he regards as a sin against the Lord in whose service he is.—[There is not the least evidence that David so regarded, or had a right so to regard Nabal's fault; he acted under a weak, human impulse of unworthy revenge, from which he was estopped by God's mercy.—Tr.]

Vers. 23–31. *Abigail's address to David.*—Ver. 23 sq. In the most circumstantial manner *five* things are first mentioned as to Abigail's conduct on meeting David, before the narrative comes to her words, which in their form and content confirm what is said in ver. 3 of her understanding. Her mode of doing reverence to David is based on her conviction that he is the divinely chosen future king of Israel, comp. ver. 30. This conviction had spread not only in the king's house (Saul included), but also among the people.—**On me, me, my lord, be the blame** (בִּי אֲנִי, see Ges., § 121, 3). At the outset she gives the matter such a turn that David has to deal with her only, and is obliged to put Nabal out of sight. At the outset she assuredly opposes to David's vengeance the contradictory statement, that, on the one hand (ver. 25), she did not see David's servants and knew nothing of Nabal's contemptuous behaviour, and, on the other hand, she takes all the blame on herself. "Think not," she says, "of the bad man, Nabal; for he is what his name signifies: foolishness is his companion (עִמּוֹ with him)." Here, as often happens, foolishness appears connected with wickedness and ungodliness. "Consider me alone as the guilty person with whom thou hast to do." She does not, however, ask for pardon and forbearance; this she does not do till ver. 28; till then she urges what may turn David away from his revenge; from there on she points out to him the blessing he will receive from the Lord if he grants her request. Vers. 26, 27. She begins with "and now" each of the three sentences with which she introduces the petition, and seeks to secure David's favor for it. *First*, indicating the highest point of view in which, as a God-fearing woman, she regards this meeting with the vengeful David, she affirms that God has thus restrained him from committing a grievous sin. (אֲשֶׁר is not here the superfluous ὅτι of indirect discourse, but is (Then.) dependent on the double חַי.) So true as—so true is it—the Lord hath kept thee **from coming into blood-guiltiness and saving thyself.** David would have brought the crime of blood on himself, and with his own hand against God's will and command have procured help for himself.—*Then* she says: **May all thy enemies be as Nabal**, such fools as he; that is, thou standest under God's protection and guidance, so that all who as thine enemies will, like Nabal, do thee evil, shall like him become fools, and fall under God's punishment. Seb. Schmid: "whosoever does good to his enemies, and takes not vengeance on them, him will God Himself avenge, as it is said, Vengeance is mine, I will repay." *Thirdly*, she says, ver. 27: **And now, this present** . . . blessing (בְּרָכָה) = gift of blessing, xxx. 26; Gen. xxxiii. 11. It is a delicate feature of her wise and skilful procedure that she offers the present, with which she designs to make good her husband's neglect by dispensing what he ought to have offered, not to David himself, but to his men. On the: **in the retinue of my lord** comp. Ex. xi. 8; Judg. iv. 10 (Keil).—Ver. 28. **Forgive the trespass of thy handmaid.**—With this brief word, which rests on that other: "on me be the blame," she now makes her request for forgiveness and sparing. The following words to ver. 31 inclusive contain the promise of the divine blessing which, by fulfilling this request, David will receive instead of the curse that would follow revenge. Her personal affair serves her as occasion to speak to David of the future of his house and his life, and, indeed, she belongs to the prophetic women who, like Hannah, filled with the Spirit of the Lord, share in the theocratic inspiration and in the prophetic outlook into the future development of the theocracy. She says to David that the Lord would not leave the fulfilment of her request unrequited: 1) **For the Lord will make my lord a sure house.** Since she is

sure of David's call to the kingship of Israel, she means by "sure house" permanent *kingly rule* in his house. Comp. the divine promise, 2 Sam. vii. 8 sq. [*Bib.-Com.* compares Rahab's faith and foresight, Josh. xi. 9-13, and cites Abigail as an illustration of how faith and reason may concur now in leading men to Christ. "In connecting her prayer for forgiveness with the reference to David's future reign, she is asking for complete pardon to be in force then."—TR.] 2) **For my lord will fight the battles (wars) of the Lord.** On the expression "wars of the Lord," comp. xviii. 17. In the celebrated warrior, who has fought and conquered in the name and power of the Lord, she sees the future *royal hero*, who, in the wars which the covenant-God as King of His people will wage against their enemies, will prove himself *God's champion.* 3) **And no evil will be found in thee all thy days.** "Evil" (רָעָה) is here misfortune," not "wickedness" (Mich., Dathe). She does not mean to say: "Thy hand will not be stained with wickedness, as would be the case if thou tookest revenge for this insult;" she says that in ver. 31. Here she predicts for him safety and good fortune as the gift of the Lord.—Ver. 29 attaches itself in its content to this third affirmation. The text reads "*hath arisen*" or "*arises*" (וַיָּקָם), instead of which we must, with Then. and Böttch., after Tanchum, read it as Impf. (וְיָקֻם): **And should a man arise . . . .** Though she knows that Saul is persecuting David, she yet with delicate reserve expresses herself hypothetically. In relation to what precedes the sense is: "Though such a misfortune should come upon thee that some one should rise against thee . . . yet it will not continue." [The text, however, as rendered in Eng. A. V., gives a good sense, and, as the fact was so notorious, the more open reference to Saul's persecution could not be considered as an offence against delicacy. *Bib.-Com.*, interpreting the sense properly, renders: "Though a man is risen . . . yet," *etc.*—TR.] What is bound in a bundle is safely kept. **The bundle of the living** [Eng. A. V. life] **with the Lord** is thus the figurative expression for those whose life is under the protection of God's love. In contrast with the wicked human power, which might seek after his life, she points him to the safe preservation of his life which is involved in the inclusion of his person in the community of the godly, whose life—that is, their temporal-earthly life, since she is not speaking here of the eternal life beyond, to which Keil finds here an indirect reference*—is preserved inviolable in God's hand. Then the contrast: **But the life of thy enemies will he sling out in the pan of the sling**—an energetic expression for the divine *rejection* in contrast with gracious preservation. The "*pan*" of the sling is the hollow for the reception of the missile. See Gen. xxxii. 26 [hollow of the thigh].—Ver. 30 is the protasis, ver. 31 the apodosis. In the words: **And when the Lord shall appoint thee ruler over Israel,** Abigail shows that she is acquainted with God's choice and calling of David to be king of Israel. This she had probably learned through personal acquaintance with those prophetic circles, her spiritual affinity with which is shown by her words. Here she looks out beyond the attacks of his enemies to the goal of his divine calling which David has reached. Then (ver. 31) "this will not be a stumbling-block and vexation of heart to thee that thou didst shed blood without cause, and also that my lord with his own hand helped himself." The word "this" (זֹאת) does not refer to the request for forgiveness in ver. 28 (Keil), but to the two following facts, namely, bloodshed and self-help. The sense is: After obtaining the kingdom, thou wilt not have a bad conscience in the recollection of having shed innocent (innocent, that is, in respect to such revenge) blood, and depended on thyself for help. In the words: **And when the Lord shall do good to my lord,** she briefly includes all her wishes and hopes for David, that to her so deeply-grounded request for forgiveness (ver. 28) she may in conclusion attach the thought of future prosperity. (וְהֵיטִב is to be taken as condition or hypothetical indication of the desired result).

Vers. 32-35. *David's answer and conduct to Abigail.*—Ver. 32. Thankful acknowledgment that *the Lord* had sent her to him. So, in his whole life even in errors and faults David knows himself to be under the oversight and guidance of the divine providence.—Ver. 33. Having given due honor to the Lord, he praises Abigail's wisdom and her opposition to his purpose so displeasing to the Lord. He acknowledges that she has restrained him from bloody revenge and ungodly self-help, and confesses his sin and guilt in forming such a plan.—Ver. 34. His discourse advances rapidly to the declaration (which strengthens that thankful acknowledgment) that, but for her interposition, he would have exterminated Nabal's house. "For otherwise" (וְאוּלָם), Vulg. *alioquin*, "otherwise" [Eng. A. V. "in very deed"].—**By the life of the Lord, the God of Israel, who,** *etc.*, **I swear that if thou,** *etc.*, **that nothing would have remained.**—The thought that the Lord had brought her to meet him is here completed by the parenthetic declaration: God the Lord has here Himself interfered with my purpose, and through thee prevented the execution of the wicked deed.*—Ver. 35. David accepts the present, and dismisses Abigail with the assurance that her request is granted. "To accept the person" (נָשָׂא פָּנִים) = "to have regard to," Gen. xix. 21.

Vers. 36-38. *Nabal's death.*—Ver. 36. Abigail

* [So Abarbanel, Targ., Talmud Shab. 152, 2; Chag. 12, 2; Pirk. El. 34 (*Philippson*).—TR.]

* מֵהָרַע—Inf. Const. Hiph. from רָעַע. כִּי is dependent on a verb of affirmation which is to be supplied from the connection. The repetition of the כִּי is occasioned by the parenthesis "unless thou." The strange form תָּבֹאתִי, Impf. with termination of Perf., is either a clerical error for תָּבֹאִי, perhaps arisen from the following word, in which the final כִּי is preceded by א (Then.); comp. Olsh. *Gr.*, pp. 452, 525; or, according to Ew. § 191 c, a strengthened form of 2 fem. Impf. as תְּבוֹאתָה, Deut. xxxiii. 16 (Keil).

finds Nabal in the revel of a feast.—**Like a king's feast**, as rich and luxurious. Compare the description of the rich man, Luke xix. "*Merry on account of it*," that is, the feast. The reference (in עָלָיו) to the feast (Maur., De W., Keil), as in Prov. xxiii. 30, answers better to Nabal's thorough self-abandonment to pleasure than the reference to his person: "within him" [so Eng. A. V.]; and this view is confirmed by the following words: **he was very drunken.** Ver. 37. Not till next morning, when the wine was gone out of him, that is, not by vomiting, but by the gradual passing off of the debauch, can Abigail tell him what has happened. The choleric man is so affected by it that he has an *apoplectic stroke*. The cause of this is neither horror at his loss (Then.), for Abigail's gift to David was insignificant, nor at the danger, hitherto unsuspected, which threatened him (Cler., Mich.), for this could not surprise him, he must have contemplated its possibility when he dismissed David's messengers,*—but the violent anger and vexation of the passionate man (always hard and inflexible), because his right had been usurped, his authority as master ignored, and the whole business transacted by his wife against his will with the hated David.—**His heart . . . stone**; here we must retain the text ["he became a stone"], and not render with the VSS.: "as a stone" (Then.)., the strong hyperbole of the text corresponding to the preceding expression: "his heart *died*," and the reading of these VSS. being obviously an explanatory change [so Eng. A. V.].—Ver. 38. It is expressly said, that Nabal's death, which did not occur till ten days after the stroke, was a *dispensation of the Lord*. As an execution by God's hand, this *death* is here, though not expressly in words (as in ver. 39), yet in the connection represented as a punishment for his ungodliness.

Vers. 39–42. *Abigail David's wife.*—Ver. 39. In Nabal's sudden death David recognizes God's judgment for the insult offered him, over against the revenge which he himself would have taken, from which the Lord estopped him in order Himself to exercise vengeance. This rests on the thought that the insult offered David was also offered to the Lord, since David was the Lord's Anointed, and represented the Lord's cause. The figure is of a case in law, which is settled by the judicial decision. The "law-cause of my reproach," that is, the reproach offered me, on account of which the Lord had to appear against Nabal as Judge and Avenger. Connect the "from the hand" with "pleaded" [רָב], not with "my reproach," and render pregnantly [Germ. zeugmatically.—Tr.]: "he has conducted my cause to a conclusion out of the hand," that is, he has collected the costs from the condemned person, and has settled the matter by the infliction of the proper punishment."—**And the wickedness of Nabal.** The connection shows that these are the words of David, not of the narrator (Then.).—Ver. 40. David's formal application for the hand of Abigail.—Ver. 41. With the expression of the deepest devotion in *gesture* and *word*, according to oriental custom, she declares herself ready to become David's wife.—Ver. 42. She sets out with a small train, "five damsels," her *ordinary* retinue (הַהֹלְכוֹת לִי), to follow David's servants and become his wife.

Vers. 43, 44. *Appendix* concerning David's matrimonial and domestic relations, occasioned by the account of his marriage with Abigail.—**And Ahinoam David had taken from Jezreel**, that is, before his marriage with Abigail (Then.); *Jezreel* is not the city in Issachar (Josh. xix. 18), but in the hill-country of Judah (Josh. xv. 55, 56), near Maon, Carmel and Ziph. "And these two *also*," where "also" (גַּם) refers to *Michal*, xviii. 28.—Ver. 44. Saul "had given" (נָתַן, as the "had taken" above, in Pluperf. sense) Michal to *Palti* (2 Sam. iii. 18) to wife. *Gallim*, in Benjamin, between *Gibeah* of Saul and Jerusalem, Isa. x. 30.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The universal mourning among the whole people at Samuel's death is a sign that they had preserved the deepest impressions and influences of his reformatory work, and honored in him, even after his withdrawal from public labors, the great restorer of the genuine theocracy. Their sorrow at his decease was the deeper, the more heavily the yoke of Saul's misgovernment pressed on them. "It was as if from the noble star, as long as it shone in the heaven of the holy land, though veiled by clouds, there streamed a mild, beneficent light over all Israel. Now this star was extinguished in Israel" (F. W. Krummacher).

2. Self-help by one's *own might* through *revenge* is as sinful and ungodly when one knows or supposes that he has suffered insult for the Lord's sake, or in His service, as when one feels his own honor violated. There is always thus a headstrong and impatient anticipating of God's counsel and work in the interest of passion, opposition to the fundamental law, according to which God's justice, not man's revenge, is the guardian of moral order, and every man receives what is his in the right time and way, according to the attitude of his heart to God. By his excitable temperament, which tends to overflow in passion, David is in great danger of setting himself against the supreme tribunal of divine justice, and taking vengeance into his own hands instead of leaving it to God. "For the first time we find him not master of his spirit, overborne by the passion, which is indeed a natural trait of his character.—He purposes to break the peace, to seize the property of others, and to stain his hands with the blood of peaceful, yea, kindred citizens. This time surely he had not prayed, nor inquired of the Lord through the 'Light and Right' [Urim and Thummim]. If he had executed what his wrath suggested—and it was not his doing if it went no farther than suggestion—he would have given the death-blow to his honor and his cause" (F. W. Krummacher).

3. God rules and watches with such paternal special providence and care over those that humbly look to His guidance that, when they are in danger through their own flesh and blood of fall-

* [Not necessarily. It seems not unlikely that fright had something to do with his seizure.—Tr.]

ing into sin, He raises up persons to guide them by exhortation, warning, and instruction into the right way, He enlightens and strengthens them by His word, so that they see in good time their moral danger and how to avoid it, and go firmly on, and at last praise the Lord for such gracious preservation. "David praised God that He had kept him from sin, and yet saved his honor.—So well does everything at last turn out with those who give heed to God and their own heart. God receives them when they fall, and raises them up when they are cast down; but the ungodly, who listen to nothing and hate instruction, cool their wrath and perish" (Roos).—"That David, like every human being, was not free from desire of revenge, to which he was especially exposed from his liveliness of feeling, is shown in 1 Sam. xxv. But there is needed only a slight rousing of his conscience, and he says to Abigail (vers. 31, 32): 'The Lord be praised who hath sent thee to meet me to-day. And blessed be thy discourse, and blessed be thou,' *etc.* And what Abigail could do, could not the presence of the Holy One have done, before whom he stood when he sang his Psalm?" (Hengst., Ps. iv., 302.)

4. *Abigail* belongs to the prophetic personages of this time, and takes a prominent place among the pious women of the Old Covenant. In contrast with her ungodly, doltish, hard-hearted, thankless, avaricious, purse-proud, rough, and riotous husband, she is deeply pious, clever and intelligent, thankful, generous, humble, of noble disposition and fine tact, intellectual, and gifted with pleasing and winning speech.—Solomon says: "By wise women the house is builded, but a foolish woman destroys it." This word finds a noble confirmation in Abigail as housewife in respect to this perverse man sunk in sordid avarice and gross materialism.—"Where do we find in all the heathen world a woman comparable with Abigail, the daughter of the wilderness? Unfortunate, indeed, she is. Ah, her house, however blessed with earthly goods, is no Bethany-cottage. With deep sorrow she must call her rude, Mammon-serving husband a 'fool.' But she bears with him in patient, hopeful love and faithfulness, and doubtless often lifts holy hands to God for him. So for him she goes to David, like a sacrificial lamb taking her husband's misdeed on herself. She holds up also to David the grievous sin with which he would have laden himself if he had carried out his purpose against the man.—Indeed the truth and sincerity, the dovelike simplicity united to sanctified wisdom, which appears in the childlike-pious address of the noble woman, is worthy of our liveliest admiration. Who can fail to see that here already the Spirit from above was working mightily? Is it not almost as if in her we heard an advanced disciple of the Gospel speak? Has not her word: 'Thou shalt be bound in the bundle of the living of the Lord' been long naturalized in the language of the whole Christian congregation as a favorite expression, and as the designation of the most precious thing that man can desire on earth?" (F. W. Krummacher).—"What wisdom, what humility, what free-heartedness, what order we find in her words! How well she knew how to speak to David's heart! How well her whole discourse was suited to her position as woman! I know no example of eloquence that excels this. Doubtless she had not studied eloquence in the schools, but the Spirit of God alone made her such an orator. God put wisdom into her heart, and it flowed out in wise discourse" (Roos).—Abigail appears as an organ of the Spirit of God, the prophetic spirit breathes through her words, and she speaks to David in the manner of the prophets. She sees clearly and declares to David with vigorous, heart-searching, and conscience-piercing words, that his high-handed, revengeful purpose is against God's law and order; she convinces him of his deep guilt, and brings him to acknowledge that she is God's instrument to save him from a wicked deed which would have cast a dark shadow over his future life; she announces his future royal calling and his lofty mission therein as hero to wage the wars of the Lord against the enemies of God's people, earnestly exhorts him to walk conformably to the glory and holiness of this calling, predicts under this condition the continuance of the royal dignity in his house (comp. 2 Sam. vii.), and promises him the rich blessings of the favor of God. Thus in her is presented the type of the guardian watch-office of prophecy in relation to the royal office. Abigail could so speak only as moved or filled by the prophetic Spirit; and the means thereto was her personal relation to the prophetic circles, whose centre Samuel was till his death and to which all truly God-fearing persons attached themselves. As the prophetic community was at this time of great importance for awakening and cherishing a new religious-moral life in the people, it cannot be surprising if we meet with personages, like Abigail, among the people, filled and illuminated with the prophetic Spirit.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Chap. xxv. J. DISSELHOFF: *Let the righteous smite me kindly and reprove me:* 1) Even the beloved of the Lord, when he watches not his heart, falls into wrath that deserves reproof; 2) The gracious God sends His beloved ones the deserved reproof through some human mouth; 3) The way in which any one receives reproof shows how far he is a man after God's own heart.

Ver. 1. Remember your teachers, *etc.* Heb. xiii. 7. [The aged man is laid aside, and sinks out of the popular view; and when at length he dies, people are startled as they recall how great a man he was in his prime, how great a work he did. It is something to live so that one's death will be truly mourned by a whole people. The old, who sadly think themselves forgotten, may find solace not only in reviewing the past, but also in the persuasion that yet once again they will be vividly remembered; while the younger should strive to anticipate the feelings of that coming time, and show respect and affection while it can be fully enjoyed.—TR.]—Ver. 2 sqq. CRAMER: Wealth, consideration, power, and good fortune, are nothing without wisdom (Prov. xvii. 16). Therefore we should prefer wisdom and virtue to all temporal things; for riches and rank do not help against folly.—SCHLIER: What does money help us, when we make Mammon our idol, and know only how to rake and scrape and get rich? How well it would be if we did but once believe

that money is not man's fortune, and that with all riches we may yet be unfortunate people.—[HALL: Even the line of faithful Caleb will afford an ill-conditioned Nabal. Virtue is not, like unto lands, inheritable.—TR.]—Ver. 10 sq. BERL. B.: The fountain of his speech is avarice, and the stream is malignity. So the rich of the world are often haughty and unfriendly, and thereby show themselves to be true Nabals or fools, as Christ also named that rich farmer.—SCHLIER: Let us not look at Nabal, we will rather think of ourselves.—There is nothing that releases us from the duty of thankfulness, let the other person be as he will. To whomsoever you owe thanks, to him you should also show your thanks. And such ingratitude is doubly a wrong, when the fault on the other's part, because of which you refuse the thanks, is only an imagined fault, when you have only a wicked grudge against him, as Nabal considered David a seditious person, although he was the most faithful subject of the king.—[SCOTT: When worldly men are determined not to relieve the necessitous, they often excuse themselves by railing; by charging the vices of some poor persons upon all; and by representing almsgiving as an encouragement to idleness, impertinence, and extravagance: nor are the most excellent characters any defence against such undistinguishing invectives.—TR.]—Ver. 13. STARKE: How subject are the best of God's saints to weak passions! Ye who are pious, recognise this fact, and diligently call on God for the government of His Spirit (Jer. x. 23). SCHLIER: If wrong is done us, we will commit vengeance to the Lord, and will be afraid of all self-revenge. He who suffers injuries and commits his revenge to the Lord, is a righteous man; but it is unmanly to give free course to one's revenge, and to do what flesh and blood prompts.—BERL. B.: David here felt something quite human, and fell into sudden heat at the affront offered him, and the contemptuous ingratitude of the rude arch-churl. His passions started up, and most of all because Nabal had treated him shamefully when he had done him no hurt. In such a case it may well be said: "The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God" (James i. 20).—[Ver. 13. HENRY: "Is this thy voice, O David?" Can this man after God's own heart speak thus unadvisedly with his lips? .... Is this he who, but the other day, spared him who sought his life, and yet now will not spare anything that belongs to him who had only put an affront on his messengers? Lord, what is man! What need have we to pray, Lord, "lead us not into temptation!" Ver. 18: HENRY: The passion of fools often makes those breaches in a little time, which the wise, with all their wisdom, have much ado to make up again.—TR.]—Ver. 19. STARKE: Silence has its time, speech has also its time. Well for those who know how to suit themselves thereto (Eccl. iii. 7 sq.).

Ver. 22. BERL. BIB.: David here completely changes into a barbarous man, and forgets himself altogether. If this purpose had been carried into execution, Saul would for the first time have had a just cause for pursuing him as a disturber of the public peace.—Ver. 23 sqq. SCHLIER: Men's wrath is a frightful enemy, and works not the righteousness of God, and yet there is a means of making this enemy no longer hurtful, namely, a friendly, loving word.—Let us especially when one falls into wrath observe well whether we cannot perhaps quiet such wrath by a mild, gentle word. A word spoken in season, and with an eye to the Lord, is not in vain.—When we are on a bad way, the Lord comes not in miracles and signs to bring us to good ways, but He interposes through men. He warns us through parents and friends and other connections, and their word is the Lord's word.—Ver. 27. STARKE: Free and rich gifts bring blessing with them; therefore give, and it is given to you (2 Cor. ix. 5, 6).—OSIANDER: Ver. 29. Our life is not in the power of our enemies, except so far as God permits it them (Job ii. 6).—[Ver. 31. HENRY: When we are tempted to sin, we should consider how it will appear in the reflection. Let us never do anything for which our own conscience will afterward have occasion to upbraid us.—TAYLOR: Only a woman could have managed such a negotiation as this so smoothly and successfully; but only a God-fearing woman would have managed it so as to bring David to a sense of the sinfulness of the act which he had been about to commit.—Vers. 32–35. HALL: A good heart is easily stayed from sinning, and is glad when it finds occasion to be crossed in ill purposes.—Wicked vows are ill made, but worse kept. Our tongue cannot tie us to commit sin. Good men think themselves happy, that since they had not the grace to deny sin, yet they had not the opportunity to accomplish it.—TR.]—Vers. 36–38. SCHLIER: So true it is that sin is ruin to the people. What multitudes think that with avarice one can get rich, and yet avarice is a root of all evil; how many think by hard-heartedness and selfishness to get on, and yet thereby every one is only building up his own misfortune; what multitudes think that if they should give themselves up to excesses, they would get pleasure and enjoyment therefrom, and yet all good-living comes only of evil.—[HALL: It was no time to advise Nabal, while his reason was drowned in a deluge of wine. A beast, or a stone, is as capable of good counsel as a drunkard. O that the noblest creature should so far abase himself as for a little liquor to lose the use of those faculties whereby he is a man!—"O that men should put an enemy in their mouths to steal away their brains!"—TR.]—Ver. 39 sqq. SCHLIER: It is a good thing to trust in the Lord and give up everything to Him. All self-revenge in every case comes of evil; but to contain one's self, to suppress one's wrath, to turn over vengeance to the Lord, brings good fortune and blessing.

[Vers. 2–11. *Nabal:* 1) His advantages: *a*) Of excellent family (ver. 3, comp. Josh. xiv. 6; xv. 13); *b*) Very wealthy; *c*) Having a wife most remarkable not only for personal beauty (ver. 3), but for thoughtfulness, energy, tact and grace. 2) His faults: *a*) Avaricious and stingy in the extreme; *b*) Yet ostentatious of his wealth (ver. 36); *c*) A drunken sot; *d*) A fool; *e*) Rude and insulting habitually (ver. 17). What a son of Caleb! what a husband for Abigail! 3) His ignoble end. Remembered for his faults, and from his connection with the men he insulted.

[Vers. 23–31. *A specimen of the soft answer that turneth away wrath:* 1) She takes the blame on

herself, so as to divert attention from the offender (ver. 24). 2) She extenuates the offence, and makes amends for it, as far as the circumstances admit (vers. 25, 27). 3) She delicately assumes that the wrathful purpose will be abandoned through divine influence (ver. 26). 4) She turns the angry man's mind towards a future of great and sure prosperity, through Jehovah's blessing (vers. 28, 29). 5) She declares that in that happy time he will be glad he did not to-day incur blood-guiltiness (vers. 30, 31). The sum of the whole is that she makes him forget his wrath in thoughts of Jehovah and of the brilliant future which Jehovah has in reserve for him. The result appears in vers. 32, 33.

[Vers. 32, 33. SOUTH: "Prevention of sin is one of the greatest mercies that God can vouchsafe a man in this world." SOUTH *a*) shows the danger that sin unprevented may never be pardoned, and *b*) argues that prevention is better than pardon; and in the "Application," urges *a*) that a higher satisfaction is to be found from a conquered than from a conquering passion; *b*) that the temper with which we receive providential prevention of sin is a criterion of the gracious or ungracious disposition of our hearts; *c*) that we ought thankfully to acquiesce in any providential crosses, since these may be the instruments of preventing grace.—TR.]

VIII. *David, betrayed again by the Ziphites, spares Saul the second time.*

CHAPTER XXVI. 1–25.

1 AND the Ziphites came unto Saul to Gibeah, saying, Doth not David hide him-
2 self in the hill of Hachilah[1] *which is*[2] before Jeshimon. Then [And] Saul arose
and went down to the wilderness of Ziph, having three thousand chosen men of
3 Israel with him, to seek David in the wilderness of Ziph. And Saul pitched in
the hill of Hachilah which is before Jeshimon in the way, but [and] David abode
4 in the wilderness. And he saw that Saul came after him into the wilderness, David
therefore [And David] sent out spies, and understood that Saul was come in very
5 deed.[3] And David arose and came to the place where Saul had pitched. And
David beheld the place where Saul lay, and Abner, the son of Ner, the captain of
the host; and Saul lay in the trench [wagon-rampart],[4] and the people pitched
round about him.
6 Then answered David [And David answered] and said to Ahimelech the Hitt-
ite and to Abishai, the son of Zeruiah, brother to Joab, saying, Who will go down
7 with me to Saul to the camp? And Abishai said, I will go down with thee. So
[And] David and Abishai came to the people by night, and behold, Saul lay sleep-
ing within the trench [in the wagon-rampart], and his spear stuck in the ground
at his bolster [head],[5] but [and] Abner and the people lay round about him.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. Here, as in xxiii. 19, there is diversity of spelling, Syr. and Arab. having "Havilah," and some MSS. and Edd. "Habilah;" but the Heb. text seems preferable.—TR.]

[2] [Ver. 1. The Rel. is supplied in ver. 3 and in xxiii. 19, and is involved in the connection. For הַיְשִׁימוֹן Aq. has τῆς ἠφανισμένης, as if from שָׁמֵם, "the desolated," and Sym. ἐρήμου, "the desert."—TR.]

[3] [Ver. 4. Instead of אֶל־נָכוֹן, Ewald would read אֶל־נֶקֶר מְעָרָה, "into the fissure of a cave," partly after the Sept. Κεϊλά, or, as Thenius affirms, for the purpose of introducing here a trace of his alleged "original narrative," though the context shows that Saul was not in a cave, but in a wagon-rampart (ver. 5). The text-phrase occurs in xxiii. 23 in the sense "certainly," and is quite intelligible here, though, as Wellhausen remarks, its position is strange, we should expect it after וַיֵּדַע, while after בָּא שָׁאוּל we should look for the name of the place to which Saul goes. The Sept. gives not only ἕτοιμος, but also the place *from* which Saul comes, ἐκ Κεϊλά, which throws no light on the sense; Vulg. and Chald. support the Heb., and Syr. and Arab. render "after him," "to him." On the whole there does not seem sufficient reason for altering the text; the VSS. testify that there was something after שָׁאוּל, and nothing better than this offers itself.—TR.]

[4] [Ver. 5. As in xvii. 20. Here the VSS. vary greatly, some laying hold of the idea of the Heb. verb (עָגַל) "round" (Aq., Sym., στρογγυλώσις, another reading of Aq. κάμπη), others giving it as chariot (Sept. λαμπήνη), Sym. (σκηνή) and Vulg. (tentorium) thence passing to the notion of "tent," while Syr. and Vulg. take the ordinary meaning of the word "way." Bib. Com. proposes (without ground) to read מְעִיל, and thus bring this passage into accordance with xxiv. 5.—TR.]

[5] [Ver. 7. "The place at his head," see on xix. 13. Derive from מְרַאֲשֹׁת.—TR.]

8 Then said Abishai [And Abishai said] to David, God[6] hath [*ins.* this day] de-
livered thine enemy[7] into thine hand this day [*om.* this day]; now, therefore [and
now,] let me smite him, I pray thee, with the spear even [*om.* even] to the earth[8]
9 at [*om.* at] once, and I will not *smite* him the second time. And David said to
Abishai, Destroy[9] him not; for who can stretch forth his hand against the Lord's
10 [Jehovah's] anointed, and be guiltless? David said furthermore [And David
said], As the Lord [Jehovah] liveth, [*ins.* but] the Lord [Jehovah] shall smite
him, or his day shall come to die [and he shall die], or he shall descend into battle
11 and perish. The Lord [Jehovah] forbid[10] that I should stretch forth mine hand
against the Lord's [Jehovah's] anointed; but, I pray thee, take thou now [and
now, take] the spear that is at his bolster [head] and the cruse of water, and let
12 us go. And David took the spear and the cruse of water from Saul's bolster
[head],[11] and they gat them away, and no man saw it, nor knew it, neither awaked,
for they were all asleep, because [for] a deep sleep[12] from the Lord [Jehovah] was
fallen upon them.
13 Then David went over to the other side, and stood on the top of an hill [the
14 mountain] afar off, a great space being between them, And David cried to the peo-
ple and to Abner, the son of Ner, saying, Answerest thou not, Abner? Then
15 [And] Abner answered and said, Who art thou that criest to the king? And
David said to Abner, Art not thou a *valiant* [*om.* valiant][13] man? and who is like
to thee in Israel? wherefore, then, hast thou not kept thy lord the king? for there
16 came one of the people in to destroy the king thy lord. This thing is not good that
thou hast done. As the Lord [Jehovah] liveth, ye are worthy to die, because ye
have not kept [watched over] your master [lord] [*ins.* over] the Lord's [Jehovah's]
anointed. And now, see where the king's spear is, and the cruse[14] of water that
was at his bolster [head].
17 And Saul knew [recognized] David's voice and said, Is this thy voice, my son
18 David? And David said, It is my voice, my lord, O king. And he said, Where-
fore doth my lord thus [*om.* thus] pursue after his servant? for what have I done?
19 or [and] what evil is in mine hand? Now, therefore [And now], I pray thee, let
my lord the king hear the words of his servant. If the Lord [Jehovah] have
stirred thee up against me, let him accept an offering; but if *they be* [*it be*] the
children of men, cursed be they before the Lord [Jehovah], for they have driven
me out this day from abiding[15] in the inheritance of the Lord [Jehovah], saying,
20 Go, serve other gods. Now, therefore, [And now,] let not my blood fall to the

[6] [Ver. 8. Sept. κύριος, Jahveh. This variation in the divine names may be error in the Sept., or it may be from variation in manuscripts; there is no decisive internal reason for the use of one name rather than the other.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 8. So the Qeri (Kethib is plural), which is found in the text of several MSS. and Edd.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 8. The Heb. construction: "with the spear and in the ground," is unusual; from xvii. 11; xix. 10, we should expect: "with the spear in him and in the ground" (Wellh.).—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 9. Sept.: "humble (שׁחה) him not;" here inappropriate.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 11. Literally: "be it a profane thing to me from Jehovah," Erdmann "on Jehovah's account," or, it may be "by, through Jehovah" (as in Eng. A. V.).—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 12. The form is variously explained (מְרַאֲשֹׁתֵי), some taking it for מִמְּר׳, one Mem falling out (so Erdmann), others from a noun רָאֲשֹׁת (so Fürst). In any case we have to suppose the presence of the Prep. מִן.—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 12. This word (תַּרְדֵּמָה) is used only a few times in the Old Testament, and apparently of a supernatural sleep. In prose it occurs, besides here, only in Gen. ii. 21; xv. 12, in both which places the sleep is supernatural. So in Job, Eliphaz (iv. 13) and Elihu (xxxiii. 15) refer to revelations from God, and in Isa. xxix. 10 the רוּחַ תַּרְדֵּמָה is a divine judicial infliction. Even in Prov. xix. 15 the "deep sleep," which is the result of slothfulness, is viewed, from the connection, as a part of God's moral government of men. A distinctly supernatural sleep would, therefore, seem to be here intended. This is the general feeling of the Greek renderings of the word (Sept. θάμβος, Aq. καταφορά, Sym. κάρος, Theod. ἔκστασις); Syr., Arab., Vulg., Chald., render "sleep;" Sam. Vers. gives תנומת, "sleep," in Gen. xv. 12, and in ii. 21 פילוקא, compared by Uhlemann with Rabb. הַפְלָגָה (hyperbole) in sense of "ecstasy," but comp. Talm. פְּלַק, "bind," hence, perhaps, "a binding sleep."—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 15. The Adj. is understood, though not expressed, in Heb. as in English.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 16. On the construction see Erdmann. The אֵת might be regarded an emphatic sign introducing the second thing mentioned, which might then be in the Acc.: "and as to the cruse." The Vulg. inserts a second "where?" the Sept. omits it where the Heb. has it—two ways of smoothing over the difficulty of the construction.—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 19. Literally: "from joining myself to" (Ges.). So Aq. ἅπτεσθαι, Sym. συνδυάζεσθαι, Sept. μὴ ἐστηρίχθαι.—Tr.]

earth before the face of the Lord [Jehovah]; for the king of Israel is come out to
seek a flea,[16] as when [*om.* when] one doth hunt a [the] partridge in the mountains.
21 Then said Saul [And Saul said],[17] I have sinned; return, my son David; for I
will no more do thee harm, because my soul [life] was precious in thine eyes this
22 day; behold, I have played the fool, and have erred exceedingly. And David
answered and said, Behold the king's spear![18] and let one of the young men come
23 over and fetch it. [*Ins.* And] the Lord [Jehovah] render to every man his righteousness and his faithfulness; for the Lord [Jehovah] delivered thee into *my*[19] hand
to-day, but [and] I would not stretch forth mine hand against the Lord's [Jeho-
24 vah's] anointed. And behold, as thy life was much set by this day in my eyes, so
let my life be much set by in the eyes of the Lord [Jehovah], and let him deliver
25 me out of all tribulation. Then [And] Saul said to David, Blessed be thou, my
son David; thou shalt both do great *things*, and also shalt surely prevail. So
David went on his way, and Saul returned to his place.

[16] [Ver. 20. Or, "a single flea," as in xxiv. 15. This repetition is somewhat surprising, and the Sept. reading "my soul" seems better. The repetition of the phrase would enter into the question whether we are to suppose two betrayals by the Ziphites, or only two accounts of the same betrayal.—Tr.]

[17] [Ver. 21. Syr., Arab. and 2 MSS. have "Saul said to David."—Tr.]

[18] [Ver. 22. The Art. with חֲנִית (om. in Qeri) in stat. const. is strange, but not impossible, especially where the defining noun is comparatively insignificant, or the defined is to be brought out more prominently, as here. See Ew., § 290 *d*, Philippi, "*Stat. Const. im Heb.*," p. 36 sq.—Tr.]

[19] [Ver. 23. The insertion of the suffix is supported by many VSS., MSS. and EDD.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The comparison of chap. xxvi. *with the section* xxiii. 19–24, xxiv., shows that the narratives agree in *three principal points*, in the treachery of the Ziphites towards David, in the persecution of David by Saul, and in the sparing of Saul by David. There is besides much concerning localities, connected circumstances, conversation, wherein an agreement cannot be denied. Ver. 1 = xxiii. 19, the coming of the Ziphites to Saul, and their information as to David's whereabouts. Ver. 2 = xxiv. 3 [2], Saul's march against David with three thousand men. Vers. 8–11 = xxiv. 5–7 [4–6.], David's protest against laying hands on Saul as the anointed of the Lord. Ver. 17 = xxiv. 17 [16], Saul's question about the voice of David. Ver. 18 = xxiv. 10–12 [9–11.], David's affirmation of his innocence. Ver. 20 = xxiv. 15 [14] concerning the flea. Ver. 21 = xxiv. 18 [17.] Saul's penitent confession of his guilt. Ver. 23 = xxiv. 13–16 [12–15], David's appeal to his innocence and to the divine justice. Ver. 25 = xxiv. 20, 21 [19, 20], Saul's invocation of blessing.

But it does not follow necessarily from these agreements that these narratives are two accounts of the same event, as Ew., Then., De Wette, Bleek (the last, however, "with some probability" only) and others suppose. The wilderness of Ziph, and especially the strong, protected position on the mountain Hachilah, might well seem to David on his return from the wilderness of Paran a suitable abiding-place for himself and his men. That the Ziphites, who held with Saul, consequently again showed him David's abode cannot, however, seem strange. The coincidence as to the three thousand men need not be regarded as showing that there was only one occurrence, since according to xiii. 2 Saul had found a body of "three thousand chosen men out of Israel" (as they are called here also xxvi. 2) as a standing army, with which guard he might easily under similar circumstances have marched a second time against David. Thenius, indeed, affirms that "Saul must have been a moral monster, which he, however, evidently was not, if he had deliberately and under the persuasion of the same persons made a second attempt on David's life after the latter had so magnanimously spared his life." Against which Nägelsbach (*Herz.* XII., 402 sq.) rightly says: "That Saul marched a second time against David is psychologically only too easily explained, even though he was no moral monster. His hatred to David was so deeply rooted that it could be only temporarily suppressed by that magnanimous deed, not extinguished." Saul's inner life under the dominion of envy and hate towards David, on the one hand, and of the various influences of the better spirit, on the other hand, had hitherto been full of vacillations and contradictions. Why should it seem strange if, in the better impulses which, through David's presence, words, and noble conduct, got suddenly the upper hand and lasted for awhile, there followed in all the stronger reaction of the evil spirit, especially as the spur to violent procedure against David again came from the same quarter as before? How little David himself relied on the permanence of Saul's good inclinations (expressed in xxiii. 19–24, xxiv.) appears from the fact that he did not leave the wilderness, and foreseeing a repetition of Saul's persecution, determined to go to another land. Thenius' own remark on xxvii. 1 sq., that "David knew how quickly Saul could change his mind, and therefore preferred to leave the country," confirms the clear statement of the preceding history as to Saul's vacillation and moral ungodliness, which makes a new persecution, as narrated in chap. xxvi. psychologically and ethically easily explicable. According to this remark of Thenius, therefore, the account of this second march fits in psychologically between chaps. xxiv. and xxvii., which sections are referred by him to the same author. Thenius affirms that "this narrative

[chap. xxvi.] is shown by the *dramatic form of the action* (Night—Secret entry into the camp—Spear and water-cruse—Ironical address to Abner), by an *improbability* (ver. 24), *individual declarations* (vers. 19, 20), and in part also by the *language* (vers. 6, 11, 12) to be the later, resting on *popular tradition;* but these particulars pertain to those points of the narrative in which its difference from the former account (xxiii., xxiv.), and therefore its reference to another occurrence may be recognised, as will appear in the explanation of the special points and the comparison with the related passages. See Keil's excellent remarks.

Ver. 1. The information given by the Ziphites concerning David supposes that he had returned from the wilderness of Paran into the wilderness of Judah in consequence of his marriage with Abigail. "In the face of [over against] the desert;" for which we have in xxiii. 19 more exactly "on the right;" that is, south of the desert. The agreement with the words of xxiii. 19 is the result of the narrator's desire to conform the account of this second occurrence to that of the first in the points in which there was essential agreement.* Ver. 2. The "three thousand chosen men of Israel" are the permanent guard whose formation is mentioned in xiii. 2.—Ver. 3 sq. Saul's camp was *near* the mountain Hachilah "on the way," that is, in a well-known highroad passing by. **And David abode in the wilderness**; that is, he had withdrawn from the hill Hachilah (where the Ziphites reported him as being, and Saul sought first to attack him) farther into the wilderness, and was then on the highland (comp. ver. 6: "who will go *down* with me?"), while Saul was encamped on the road in the plain. On hearing (וַיַּרְא = "he learned," *not* "he *saw*") that Saul had followed him into the wilderness, he assured himself of the fact by scouts. **Certainly** [Eng. A. V. "in very deed," Heb. "to certainty"—Tr.], undoubtedly, comp. xxiii. 23. [So in xxiii. 24, 25 David learns (probably by scouts) that Saul is come into the wilderness of Maon, south of the desert.—Tr.]—Ver. 5. David now himself goes by night to examine Saul's camp and position. The Sept. and Vulg. add: "*secretly*," an explanatory addition which we need not insert in the text (= בַּלָּט. Thenius). He found Saul at the wagon-rampart† (see on xvii. 29) with *Abner*, his general, and the army camped around him. David was accompanied by *Ahimelech*, the Hittite, who is nowhere else mentioned, and *Abishai* "the son of Zeruiah," David's sister (1 Chron. ii. 16), and brother of Joab, afterwards one of David's captains (2 Sam. xviii. 2; xx. 6; xxiii. 19).—The difference in particulars between this narrative and that of xxiii. 19 sq. is as follows: *There* on Saul's approach David proceeds to the wilderness of *Maon*, where he is surrounded, and only escapes capture by the invasion of the Philistines, which compels Saul to withdraw, xxiii. 25–28. *Here*, on the contrary, nothing is said of such a Philistine invasion; Saul's camp is on another spot; the endangered person is not David, but Saul, whose camp David enters at night, and whom David might have killed. [However, this incident is parallel to xxiv. 3 [2] sq.—Tr.] *There*, after Saul's return from the Philistine campaign, the scene of the persecution is *Engedi*, where David is hidden in a cave into which Saul enters, xxiv. 2–4—completely different circumstances and situations.

Ver. 6 sq. *Ahimelech, the Hittite.* This Canaanitish people, already settled around Hebron in Abraham's time (Gen. xv. 23), dwelt, after the return of the Israelites from Egypt, in the hill-country of Judah along with the Amorites reaching as far north as toward Bethel (Judg. ii. 26), subdued but not exterminated by the Israelites. A portion of them had maintained a certain independence. Comp. 1 Kings ix. 20; x. 29; 2 Kings vii. 6. In the time of Saul's reign the internal contrast between the Israelites and the remnant of the Canaanites may have greatly diminished, so that a Hittite could occupy so prominent a position with David, and be employed by him in his service. For, according to this narrative, he must have held a preferred position with David, along with *Abishai* (2 Sam. ii. 18; xvi. 9), who is here named. *Uriah* also was a *Hittite* (2 Sam. xi. 3, 6; xxiii. 39).—They find Saul in his camp *asleep*, his "*spear* (the sign of royal authority, in place of the sceptre) stuck in the ground at his head."—Ver. 8. **Thy enemy**—the Sing. [Qeri] is preferable [Keth. has Plu.]. Abishai speaks merely according to the right of retaliation and the usage of war. The sense of his words is: I will pin him to the ground so thoroughly with *one* blow that it will not need another to kill him. Vulg.: "there will be no need of a second."—Ver. 9. David rejects not the first part of Abishai's word: "God has given thy enemy into thy hand," but the second: "I will transfix him." For certainly God had given Saul into his hand; but "the divine providence thus gives David opportunity not to slay his enemy, but rather to conquer him by a new kindness" (*Berl. B.*); David's reply to Abishai is a brief, strict *prohibition:* **Destroy him not**, and the reason for it, made more earnest and pressing by the interrogative form: **Who stretches out his hand against the Lord's anointed and goes unpunished?**—(נִקָּה = Exod. xxi. 19; Num. v. 31). By the royal anointing Saul's person was made sacred and inviolable. As anointed he was the Lord's property. Therefore only *God's hand* could touch his life. And so David says, ver. 10, with an oath: "As God lives, his life is in God's hand only, and far be it from me to touch it." Translate not with De Wette: "No! but Jehovah will smite him, either his day will come, *etc.*", but with Then. and Keil: "Unless the Lord smite him, *etc.*", the apodosis being: "far be it from me, *etc.*" [ver. 11]. David mentions three possible cases: 1) sudden death by a

* [We should, however, expect an indication of the repetition of the occurrence by some such phrase as "the Ziphites came *again* to Saul," and the absence of such indication is one of those delicate features which favor the supposition of a single occurrence, while, on the other hand, the argument for two occurrences, as given by Erdmann and others, cannot be considered a weak one.—Tr.]

† [The proposal of *Bib.-Com.* to read מְעִיל, "garment," and represent Saul as sleeping in his garment, as in xxiv. 5 [4], is an unfounded conjecture, and the assimilation of the two accounts in this way can be effected only by a violent reconstruction of the narratives, the necessity for which is a serious objection to the supposition of one occurrence.—Tr.]

stroke (as in xxv. 38); 2) dying a natural death "in his day;" the day of death, as Job xiv. 6; xv. 32; 3) falling in battle. "Far be it to me *from Jehovah*" (מִיהוָה), that is, as in xxiv. 7, on the part of the Lord, on the Lord's account I will not smite him.—Abishai is ordered to take the *spear* at his head, and the *water pitcher* (not *basin*, Ewald, comp. 1 Kings xvii. 12 sq.); then, says he, we will "*go our way*" (לְנוּ).—Ver. 12. **David took**, it is said (though David had ordered Abishai to take), having reference to the fact that David was the controlling head.* Their unobserved taking of the spear and cruse and subsequent departure is vividly portrayed in three expressions: **No one saw, no one observed, no one woke.**—The narrative represents this as a *divine arrangement* by the words: **for a deep sleep from the Lord was fallen on them**, that is, God threw them into deep slumber, that David might so act. Comp. xiv. 15, "the terror of God," Ps. lxxvi. 7 (6) "at thy rebuke, God of Jacob, both chariot and horse are cast into a *deep sleep*." —A comparison of vers. 6–12 with xxiv. 5–8 [Eng. 4–7] shows the great difference between the two narratives in spite of the sameness of the speeches of David's men "God has delivered thy enemy into thy hand." *There* they say: "Do to him as seemeth thee good," and David cuts off the skirt of Saul's upper garment, whereupon he says, having in mind this deed of his and his thereby disquieted conscience: Far be it from me to lay hands on the Lord's Anointed (xxiv. 5–8 [4–7]). *Here* Abishai wishes to kill Saul, and David in connection with this wish says similar words. [The *Bib. Comm.* remarks that "the description in ver. 7 is quite compatible with David and his companion's being hid in the cave." This is true, and so far as this point is concerned we might hold the two narratives to refer to the same event. But the difficulty is the numerous important changes which must then be made in one narrative or both, and, it may be added, the great carelessness which must be ascribed to the editor. At the same time the supposition of a single incident in these two narratives does not impugn the inspiration of the Book, since we should therein have merely the error of an editor, or possibly of a transcriber.—Tr.]

Ver. 13. **David went beyond to the top of the mountain**, that is, the mountain whence he had previously reconnoitred Saul's camp, and whence he had descended, ver. 6.—The express mention of "the *great distance* and the *wide interval* between them" shows that David's conduct was here the reverse of that at the former meeting with Saul, when he followed him out of the cave and called after him (xxiv. 9 [8]). Here the danger seemed to David much greater than there. —Ver. 14. (אֶל = towards). David's call concerned *Abner* especially, because it was his duty to watch over the king's life. Vulg.: "who art thou that criest and disquietest the king?"—Ver. 15. *David's ironical speech.*—**Art thou not a man?** that is, a valiant warrior,* who is to answer for the protection and security of his king, (שָׁמַר with אֶל is unusual; עַל (Then.) is probably the original reading). Then he refers to the *peril of life*, in which Saul just before really was. **Sons of death are ye**, ye deserve death for your neglect of duty.—As *sign* thereof he shows him the *spear* and the *water-cruse*. **See, where is the king's spear?**—That was a clear proof that Saul might have been slain by him who took it away (Cler.). (אֵת־אֵי pregnant construction—supply רְאֵה, so Maurer, who refers to Judg. vi. 28). **And (see after) the water cruse**, namely, see where it is (Keil).—Ver. 17. In the darkness and at such a distance Saul could not recognize David's person, but could recognize him from his voice. **My voice!** answers David to Saul's question. As the Sept. reads simply "thy servant," Thenius combines the two and takes as original text "the voice of thy servant." But the brief "my voice," is perfectly intelligible, and the designation "servant" is involved in the added words: **My lord king.**—[It may also be said in general that the less courtly form is the more probable.—Tr.].—Ver. 18. Comp. xxiv. 10–13 [9–12]. This question as to the cause of the persecution is the affirmation of his innocence and of the groundlessness of Saul's continued hostility to him. Berl. B.: "The way in which David addresses Saul is so humble, so gentle, and so reverent, that we may sufficiently thence recognize the character of his heart."—Ver. 19. **And now, let my lord the king hear the words of his servant**; by this adjuration David will indicate to Saul how important he thinks his following words for their relation to one another and to God, and how serious a matter it is for him that Saul should weigh them. He supposes two *causes* of Saul's hostility as *possible*. First: **If the Lord hath incited thee against me.**—Wrongly Clericus: "If Jehovah incited thee, if thou deservedly attemptedst my destruction, acting in accordance with God's will, He would hear thy prayers and take care that thou shouldst never fall into my hands [which has not been the case]." For, according to this the *divine* causation would be denied, while the *human* would be in the next clause assumed as the factual one. [Clericus says only that the fact that Saul had been in David's power would show that God was not watching over him, and therefore his persecution was not with God's approval.—Tr.] David's word is based on the conception that God sometimes *incites men to evil*. Comp. 2 Sam. xvi. 10 sq., where God is said to have commanded Shimei to curse David, and 2 Sam. xxiv. 1, according to which God incited David to number the people. The idea that evil is, from one point of view, to be referred to God as its cause, is not a product of later times, but is early found in con-

* In מְרַאֲשֹׁתָיו remark 1) the double Plu. וֹת and ־ִים, especially the stat. constr. form ־ֵי, Ges. § 87, 5, Rem. 1; Ewald, § 160 *b* and *Anm.* 2, § 211 *d*; 2) מֵ for מִמְ—one מ having fallen out.

* [*Bib. Com.* "This incidental testimony to Abner's eminence as a warrior is borne out by his whole history. At the same time David's bantering tone, coupled with ver. 19, makes it probable that David considered Abner his enemy; the latter's great influence with Saul might have prevented the persecution of David. Abner may have feared David as a rival; his opposition to him is shown by his conduct after Saul's death." But all this may be explained also by Abner's devoted loyalty to his kinsman Saul.—Tr.]

nection with the idea of the divine ordering of the world, in which evil must serve God in order to bring about His saving help (Gen. l. 20 comp. with xlv. 7, 8) and reveal His judicial glory (Ex. ix. 16). David therefore supposes the case that Saul's hatred towards him rests on the divine causality,—comp. xviii. 10; xix. 9, where the "evil spirit from the Lord," which has come upon Saul, is said to be the cause of his hate to David. The "divine incitement" to evil consists, according to David's view, in the fact that Saul, sunk deep in sin by his own fault, is further given over by God to evil in that opportunity is given him to develop in deeds the evil of his heart. [Others suppose here, not so well, an immediate reference to the possession of Saul by the evil spirit, which drives him to these persecutions.—Tr.]. The words: **Let him accept** [literally, smell] **an offering**, indicate the way by which Saul, seeing whither he is come by this self-occasioned inclination to evil from God, may again come into right relation with God. "Let him smell an offering" (יָרַח; the Hiph. of רִיחַ not = "cause to smell," but = "smell;" Sept. ὀσφρανθείη, Vulg., *odoretur*, Luther, *man lasse riechen*). The odor of the offering, here to be smelled, comes from the incense which was connected with the meat-offering (of flour and groats) and was burned (Lev. ii. 15, 16; vi. 15) "for a sweet odor, a memorial to the Lord." The *smelling* of this odor represents God's *acceptance* of the offering and the offerer (Gen. viii. 21), the offering itself, the Minchah (מִנְחָה), meat-offering, signifying not *atonement*, but *sanctification of life* in devotion to the Lord, the *effect* of which is God's gracious acceptance. The sense is: "Instead of the anger, in which God drives thee to evil, mayest thou gain God's acceptance, by (as the outward offering with its sweet odor signifies) giving him thy heart and life, abstaining from evil and sanctifying thyself to Him." David thereby also indirectly affirms that the divine incitement to evil has its ground in Saul's evil nature and will. Bunsen, in general correctly: "The sense is: pray to God that He take the temptation from thee." Grotius is altogether wrong: "If this anger is just, I do not deprecate that it be appeased by my death as a victim." [Others: Let the evil spirit from God be driven away by an offering to God.—Tr.].—The other case: **But if men** (have stirred thee up), **be they accursed before the Lord.**—David here refers, as in xxiv. 10 [9], to the hostile party that calumniated him to Saul, and kindled Saul's hatred against him. He sees no other way of escaping these dangers than flight to a heathen land. **For they drive me away now**; the emphasis is on the "to-day," "now" (הַיּוֹם); "they have *now* brought it about that, to be safe, I must flee the country" (Then.). His present position is such that he must regard himself as one driven out of the country. **That I cannot join myself to** [Eng. A. V., abide in] **the inheritance of the Lord**, that is, I am excluded from *association* with the Lord's inheritance (Bunsen). The Lord's inheritance is the people of God, the covenant-people. **Saying, Go, serve other gods**, not that his enemies had actually given this order, "but David looked to deeds rather than words" (Calvin); their enmity drove him out as effectually as a command. David's line of thought here is as follows: Only in the people Israel and in the land of promise has the covenant-God His dwelling, for there are all His revelations in respect to Israel; only there therefore, in the consecrated place of His dwelling can there be true worship of the Lord; outside this holy region of God's revelation and dwelling among His people is the domain of strange gods; thither driven he sees everywhere inducement and temptation to "serve other gods."—This is the ground of his wish and prayer in ver. 20: **And now, may my blood not fall to the ground far from the presence of the Lord**, that is, may I be preserved from such a fate, namely, driven from the place of the Lord's gracious presence and His people, to lose my life by violence afar off in the midst of an idolatrous people. The expression "*far from the presence of the Lord*," and the preceding words show indeed David's longing after the place of divine worship in the tabernacle, but contain nothing which necessarily points "to a later insertion of this section" (Then.), or, as Ewald affirms, echoes the "bitter lament of many who in the seventh century were banished by unrighteous kings like Manasseh." The words are sufficiently explained by the pain that David felt at his fugitive life, which must now lead him to a foreign land, where he must wander or perhaps die *far* from association in divine worship with the people of God and from the place of supplication to God. Grotius wrongly: "in the presence of the Lord, God being witness and hereafter Avenger" [so Eng. A. V., and this rendering is grammatically defensible, though here perhaps not so appropriate as the other.—Tr.].—**For the king of Israel is come out to seek a single flea**, comp. xxiv. 15 [14]. Here too the "flea" sets forth what is insignificant in contrast with the king of Israel. The sense is: Thou pursuest me, who am as weak in respect to thee as a flea in respect to him who kills it. It is herein involved not only that it is not worth Saul's while to pursue him (Then.), but also that it will be only too easy for the powerful king of Israel to conquer him, the powerless, as one crushes a flea. So understood, the words satisfactorily give the reason for the preceding "*Let not my blood fall*," which Then. wrongly calls in question. There is no reason for substituting for the text ("a flea") the Sept. reading "my soul" (Then.), which, however, expresses the same thought, "Thou seekest to kill me" as the reason for the preceding. **As one hunts a partridge in the mountains**; an unnecessary difficulty is here made (Then.) by supposing that the comparison (seeking a flea) is itself compared with something else (hunting a partridge), which would certainly be unnatural and unexampled. But there is here rather a second comparison *alongside* of the first, and with the same meaning: Thou strivest to destroy me, the insignificant and powerless in my isolation and abandonment. Thenius rejects the reading *partridge* (קֹרֵא), on the ground that the bird is found not in the *mountains* but in the *plain*, and accepts the Sept. "*horn-owl*" (הַכּוֹס), and further, regarding the designation of David as an insignificant person as here out of place, proposes to render: "as the owl hunts on

the mountains;" but, to say nothing of this untenable supposition and of the unheard-of figure of the owl as a "hunter," we reply simply with Winer in reference to the "partridge on the mountains:" "Partridges are usually not hunted on the mountains, since they stay in the fields. . . . But the text is not so absurd; . . . a single straying partridge on the mountains is not thought worth hunting, since they can be found in flocks in the plain" (*Bib. R.-W.* II. *s. v.*). (Also the German "*Rebhuhn*" [partridge] is derived from "*rufen*" [to call]. Bunsen.*) But from the connection and the words of David, who has before lamented his enforced separation from association with the people of Israel, the following thought also is expressed in this comparison, as in the other: Me, isolated from God's people, far from all association, a fugitive from thy machinations on the mountain heights, thou seekest at all costs to destroy, as one hunts a single fugitive partridge on the mountains only to kill it at all costs, while otherwise from its insignificance it would not be hunted, since partridges are to be found in the field in flocks.—"This speech of David was thoroughly suited to sharpen Saul's conscience and lead him to give up his enmity, if he still had an ear for the voice of truth" (Keil). While these words are similar to those in xxiv. 10–16 [9-15] (as natural from the similarity of the circumstances), the following essential differences yet exist. *There* David, in order to prove to Saul how unfounded his illusion is (namely, that David is seeking his life), shows him that his life was in his (David's) hand, that he would not touch the Lord's anointed but spared him; *here*, on the contrary, he calls Saul to account for his ceaseless persecution, represents to him that he is determined to destroy him who, compared with the mighty king, is insignificant, and presses him to abandon this purpose.

Ver. 21. To these words of David corresponds with precision Saul's answer (ver. 21), which is essentially different from that in xxiv. 18 [17]. With the *confession:* **I have sinned**, he joins the *request* that David would return, and the *promise* that he would no more do him evil, and adds as *reason;* **because my life was precious in thy eyes this day**.—[Keil thinks that Saul is less penitent, more hardened here than in chap. xxiv., and this shows the difference of the events; but Thenius and Bib. Comm. are right in declaring that Saul's expression of sorrow and repentance is as decided here as in the former case. No good argument can be drawn from this for either view.—Tr.].—Ver. 22. David offers to return the spear and cruse, the sign that he had spared Saul's life.—Vers. 23, 24. These words attach themselves immediately to that silently eloquent proof of his guilelessness and pure disposition. He 1) declares himself to be a "*man of righteousness and faithfulness,*" and assigns as proof his sparing Saul's life. (For בְּיָד read with all the vss. בְּיָדִי, the ׳ might easily fall out on account of the following ו). Thenius holds this self-praise of David as proof that the section xxiv. 18–20 [17–19], where Saul praises and blesses David, is the original. But what is this alleged "self-praise" but the positive *affirmation* of what David says in xxiv. 12 [11] (regarded by Then. as original): "there is no evil in my hand and no iniquity, and I have not sinned against thee," and in his confident appeal to God's righteous judgment, vers. 13, 16 [12, 15]? All that is the content of the idea "*righteousness,*" which he here, in contrast with Saul's unrighteousness, applies to himself. And no more is it self-praise when he speaks of his *faithfulness*, but simply the expression of his reverence towards the Lord's Anointed, in spite of Saul's perfidious and injurious conduct.—The words "the Lord gave thee into my hand" include the thought: "Thereby did the Lord put me to the test." This test David had stood, exhibiting "righteousness and faithfulness." And therefore he can now 2) say in good conscience: **The Lord will requite the man** (namely, me) [Eng. A. V. better, "render to every man." —Tr.]. The *explanation* of this assertion is given in ver. 24: **And behold, as thy life was much set by this day in my eyes, so will my life,** *etc.*, that is, the Lord will requite my righteousness and faithfulness towards thee in sparing *thy life as the Lord's Anointed*, by so valuing my life as to save it from the dangers which thou preparest for it. It is difficult to see why (Thenius) such an expectation of the Lord's protection and help, founded on a good conscience, is not genuinely Davidic, and therefore to be esteemed not original. Yet David here says nothing essentially different from what he declares in xxiv. 13, 16 [12, 15] of the Lord as his judge, who will avenge him on Saul, give success to his cause, and save him from Saul's hand. Stähelin's remark (*Leben David's*, p. 25), that David liked to praise himself like the Arabian heroes, is thoroughly wrong; for David everywhere gives God the highest praise, even where, as here, he affirms what is true of himself.—"*All tribulation*" (כָּל־צָרָה), all the *straits* which Saul would hereafter, as he knew, prepare for him. For Saul confesses indeed that he has done him wrong, and will no more work evil against him; but this, recollecting Saul's instability and that former tearful promise of his [xxiv. 16], he could regard only as the expression of a momentary better feeling; behind this he saw Saul's unbroken heart, more and more hardened, which, when this gust of better feeling had passed over, would exhibit its old wickedness, yea, after the quenching of these better impulses and resolutions, must be all the more hardened.*—Ver. 25. Saul's last word to David: "**Blessed be thou, my son David; thou wilt both undertake and also fully perform**, does not express a changed *disposition*, love instead of the old enmity, but the fleeting better feeling which David's noble conduct had induced, and which compelled him to affirm that David would come victorious forth through the

* [The Heb. word for "partridge," *qore* means "the caller," and so perhaps the Eng. "quail." Pictet (*Orig. Indoe europ.*) thinks that *rebhuhn*—"speckled bird," and *perdix, partridge* has perhaps the same meaning.—Tr.]

* [*Bib.-Com.* remarks that the sentiment here ascribed to David is put into Saul's mouth in xxiv. 17-19 [Heb. 18-20], and that (supposing the same event related in xxiv. and xxvi.) a parallel case is found in Matt. xxi. 41, and Luke xx. 16. However this does not favor the supposition of one event, for as in the Gospels both Jesus and His hearers may have said on the same occasion what is reported, so here Saul may have said at one time what David said at another.—Tr.]

Lord's help out of all the straits of his persecutions.—The content and character of Saul's words in xxiv. 17–23 [Eng. 16–22] are very different from these, though both contain Saul's confession of wrong. But the first time [xxiv.] he makes his confession with tears, with acknowledgment of the fruitlessness of his attempts against David and the unavoidable transition of the kingdom to the latter, whom he adjures them to spare his family. But here his inward emotion is not nearly so strong and deep; he affirms merely that he is sorry for his former conduct, and will not repeat it. Keil is therefore right in saying that "he is evidently here already much more hardened." **And David went his way, and Saul returned to his place.** Thus they parted forever. Berl.-B.: "Their souls were not at one; therefore they remained asunder." It is worthy of note that it is not said of Saul, as xxiv. 23 [22]: "He returned to his house." This points to the fact that he continued his persecution of David, as also appears from the latter's flight (hinted at in vers. 19, 20) to the Philistines, where we find him in chap. xxvii. [It is not necessary to suppose that Saul continued his pursuit of David. David's apprehension in xxvii. 1 was a general one, and very natural, even though Saul had returned home to his "place" in Gibeah.—Tr.]

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The conception "that *God incites to sin*" in the Old Testament belongs to the same circle of thought as the idea, carried over by Paul into the New Testament, of man's *hardening* in sin as a *divine act*. The hardening pertains only to the inner being, to heart and disposition (which becomes insusceptible to the influences of the divine word and Spirit), to the will, which persistently sets itself against God's holy will, to the ethical habit of the whole personality, in which irreceptivity for good has become permanent in such wise that the capacity for free self-determination against the evil for the good has ceased. According to the law of His righteous moral government of the world, which punishes evil with evil, God abandons the man who shuts himself up against the invoking of the divine Spirit to the thereby engendered moral condition of inward hardening, sin becoming a factual necessity for him. The divine *incitement to evil*, on the other hand, refers to individual acts, as is shown by ver. 19 and the passages above cited, 2 Sam. xvi. 10 sq.; xxiv. 1 sq. The divine causation, however, consists not in God's producing evil, which would be inconsistent with His holiness (comp. James i. 13), but in His occasioning the evil to break forth from the hidden depths of the heart and realize itself in deeds, though this need neither presuppose nor induce hardening, is rather intended to be the mean and avenue to the salvation and bettering of the sinner. Hengstenberg on Ps. li. 6: "Sin pertains, indeed, to man. He may always free himself from it by penitence. But if he does *not* repent, then the *forms* in which sin exhibits itself are no longer under his control, but under God's dispensation, who determines them as pleases Him, as accords with the plan of His government of the world, for His own honor, and, so long as He is not absolutely rejected, for the good of the sinner. He puts the sinner in positions in which just this or that temptation specially assails him; He leads the thoughts to definite objects of sinful desire, and causes them there to remain and not pass on to others." This divine incitement to sin presupposes the actual free determination of the will in respect to the sins to which the incitement pertains. In this connection O. v. Gerlach excellently remarks on ver. 19: "That the Lord incites a man to sin . . . must always be the result of a conscious, cherished sin or sinful direction of the will, whence then come sins of deed for punishment, and also for the possible bettering of the man. In order to obviate this terrible punishment of sin by sin, David says Saul must again approach the Lord in an offering which atones for sin and restores the heart to the Lord."

2. The *inheritance* = possession, property is the people of God in so far as He is their *Lord*, who has made them *His* people by choosing them out of the mass of the other nations to be the bearer and organ of His self-revelation, and has made a *covenant* with them. Comp. Deut. i. 29; iv. 20; ix. 26, 29; Ps. xxviii. 9. The complete fulfilment of this idea of the peculiar people [= property-people] is found in the New Testament covenant-relation and the thence resulting association of men, who by Christ's redemption and reconciliation have become God's property; that is, [it is found] in the community of the kingdom in faith in Christ. The *greatest evil* David thinks to be exclusion from holy life-association with his God among idolaters. The *greatest good* for him is to belong to this property of God, and to this kingdom-community in the service of the living God. Therein is typically set forth the highest good which he who has become God's property in Christ, finds in participation in God's kingdom and its blessings.

3. There is a *self-accusation* which, like *Saul's* confession of sin (ver. 21), is far from true repentance, because it is based not on the *broken heart* and the *abandoned self-will*, but on a transient disposition and *superficial emotion*, and in the recognition of the *impossibility of carrying out one's own will* over against the divine will, and there is wanting the earnestness of self-denial. In such a condition of soul, as Saul's example shows, even these better impulses and superficial penitences gradually cease, and the judgment of hardening recedes with irretardable steps from repentance.

4. There is a *self-assertion*, as David's example shows (vers. 23, 24), which not only, without becoming self-praise and self-glorification, in *righteousness* and *faithfulness* sets one in the true light against unjust accusation and enmity, for the sake of *the Lord* and *His honor* (in whose service the man knows himself to be), but also serves to affirm the *moral worth* of one's own personality, and to maintain one's real *personal honor*, which has its root in God's service. One is not therein concerned with the affirmation of his own *merits*, but with the earnest, true *declaration of the position* which his inner life, in accordance with God's demands, and through the power of His Spirit, occupies towards God in true piety. Conscious of such relation of heart to his God, the servant of God (as David knew himself to be over against his unjust persecutor, Saul) in tribulation and sufferings has the *right* to appeal to God's righteous

judgment, and with joyful confidence to look for His help and salvation promised to the righteous and innocent.

5. Among the *Psalms of David* it is particularly the xvii. and xviii. in which there is such clear expression of earnest, conscious *power* to affirm *righteousness* and *innocence* by reason of *personal experience* of ungodly enmity and divine deliverance, that we must at least suppose the recollection of Saul's persecutions to be a concurring factor in them. In the title of Psalm xviii.: "By the servant of the Lord, by David, who spake to the Lord the words of this Song in the day when the Lord had saved him from the hand of all his enemies and *from the hand of Saul*," the reference to Saul accords with essential features in the content of the Psalm according to the points of view above indicated, though the Psalm does not refer exclusively to the time of Saul (see on 2 Sam. xxii.). But it is beyond doubt that the *whole content* of Psalm xvii. presupposes such a position and such experiences as are described here in chaps. xxiv. and xxvi.; for individual portions set forth the same ideas and thoughts that David here expresses; in vers. 1, 2, 5 is contained a similar appeal, in part to his righteousness and faithfulness, in part to God's righteous judgment, against the unrighteousness of His enemies; through the whole Psalm sounds the same tone of firm confidence in the Lord's help and victorious conduct of the course of the righteous against their enemies. Here, too, the experiences of the Sauline Period show themselves as the fruitful soil of David's psalm-poetry.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1. CRAMER: The temporal good fortune of pious men often does not last long; ere one expects it, the cross is again before their door. Therefore boast not thyself of to-morrow; for thou knowest not what a day may bring forth. Prov. xxvii. 1.—Vers. 2, 3. HEDINGER (from HALL): Good motions that fall into wicked hearts are like some sparks that fall from the flint and steel into wet tinder, lightsome for the time but soon out. Chap. xxiv. 17.—BERL. B.: Ah Saul, thou deceivedst thyself, God is stronger than thou, and thou wilt only be an occasion for new victories.—Vers. 5 sq. SCHLIER: Saul is in peril of his life; to human eyes he is lost. And who has cast him into such peril? Who else than himself? His hatred, with which he anew persecuted David. From this we should learn how constantly sin is the ruin of men. He who does evil, always does himself the greatest hurt.—[Ver. 8. Our best friend becomes our worst enemy, when he would persuade us to do wrong. Comp. Matt. xvi. 23. —TR.].—Vers. 10, 11. HEDINGER: Love and righteousness in a pious man's heart is invincible. [Vers. 9–11. HENRY: David gives two reasons why he would not destroy Saul, nor permit another to do it. 1. It would be a sinful affront to God's ordinance. Saul was the Lord's anointed king of Israel. . . . No man could resist him and be guiltless; the thing David feared was guilt, and his concern respected his innocence more than his safety. 2. It would be a sinful anticipation of God's providence; God had sufficiently showed him, in Nabal's case, that if he left it to Him to do right He would do it in due time. . . . Thus bravely does he prefer his conscience to his interest, and trust God with the issue.—TR.—Ver. 12 sq. OSIANDER: Even though opportunity for revenge is given us, yet we should not avenge ourselves, but commit vengeance to God. —SCHLIER: God grant that we may all learn to love our enemies, that we may learn to requite evil with good! For this is certain: hatred excites strife; but love helps mightily to peace, and overcomes much evil.—Ver. 14. STARKE: Even in cross and persecution one should rejoice and be of good courage.—Ver. 20. S. SCHMID: The feebler and more powerless the pious are under trouble and persecution, the more they may lean on God's support.—Ver. 21. BERL. B.: Nothing can more soften a hard disposition than humility and gentleness.—There is no sinner so hardened but God sends him now and then a ray of illumination to show him all his error. But ah! when they are awakened by such divine movings, it is only for some moments; and such a movement is scarcely past ere they fall back at once into their former life, and forget again all that they had promised. — STARKE: Although the ungodly sometimes appear as if they wished to turn and become pious, yet they soon fall off again and go on again in their ungodliness.—SCHLIER: Even if we here and there lightly make a confession of our faults, how is it as to a downright confession of sin in the sight of God? Has God's goodness led us to repentance? Has His compassion opened our heart? O let us not turn the long-suffering of God into lasciviousness.—STARKE: Truly penitent sinners must confess their sins, ask forgiveness, and promise amendment, and this not hypocritically but in all sincerity (Matt. xix. 16). ["I have sinned." Spurgeon has a sermon (Am. Ed., Third Series) upon this confession as made by seven different persons in the Bible.—TR.].—Ver. 23. God is righteous; a believing soul recognizes that to its consolation.—Ver. 24. OSIANDER: Just as God punishes one barbarity through another, so He rewards benefits with benefits. SEB. SCHMID: No one is greater than he whose soul is much set by in the eyes of God.—Ver. 25. CRAMER: Horrible wickedness, to know one thing and do another, and thus knowingly to kick against the pricks.—The ungodly must often be their own prophets. Prov. x. 24.—SEB. SCHMID: When the enemies and persecutors of the pious have long enough raged and striven against the will of God, they must at last against their will yield the victory to God and the pious. [TAYLOR: So far as we know, this was the last meeting between Saul and David; and it is pleasing to think that after all that had occurred, Saul's latest utterance to him was one of benediction; at once a vindication of David's conduct in the past, and a forecast of his glory in the future. Verily, the Psalmist was speaking from his own experience when he said, "commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in Him; and He shall bring it to pass. And He shall bring forth thy righteousness as the light, and thy judgment as the noon-day."—TR.]

[Ver. 15. "Art thou a man?" True men exhorted not to act unworthily of their manhood. —TR.]

[Ver. 21. "I have played the fool." 1) In

listening to slanderers against an innocent man (ver. 19, comp. xxiv. 9). 2) In opposing a man who evidently must succeed (ver. 25). 3) In resisting the known designs of Providence (xxiv. 20, comp. xxiii. 17). 4) In *renewing* a wrong already confessed and temporarily forsaken (xxiv. 16–22). Remark: One may confess his folly and take no step towards becoming wiser. The benefit of such a confession depends upon whether it is made in bitterness or in humility.—Tr.]

[Upon this chapter in general, comp. above on chap. xxiv.—Tr.]

IX. *David at Ziglag in the land of the Philistines.*

Chapter XXVII. 1–12.

1 And David said in his heart, I shall now perish one day by the hand of
Saul; there is nothing better[1] for me than that I should speedily escape into the
land of the Philistines; and Saul shall despair[2] of me to seek me any more in any
2 coast of Israel; so shall I escape out of his hand. And David arose and he [*om.*
he] passed over with [he and] the[3] six hundred men that were with him unto Ach-
3 ish,[4] the son of Maoch, king of Gath. And David dwelt with Achish at Gath, he
and his men; every man with his household, *even* [*om.* even] David with [and] his
two wives, Ahinoam the Jezreelitess, and Abigail the Carmelitess,[5] Nabal's wife
4 [Nabal's wife, the Carmelitess]. And it was told Saul that David was fled to Gath;
and he sought no more again for him.
5 And David said unto Achish, If I have now found grace in thine eyes, let them
give me a place in some town in the country [in one of the country-cities], that I
may dwell there; for why should thy servant dwell in the royal city with thee?
6 Then [And] Achish gave him Ziklag that day; wherefore Ziklag pertaineth unto
7 [to] the kings of Judah unto this day. And the time that David dwelt in the coun-
try of the Philistines was a full [*om.* full] year and four months.
8 And David and his men went up and invaded the Geshurites and the Gezrites[6]
and the Amalekites; for[7] those *nations* were of old the inhabitants of the land, as
9 thou goest to Shur, even [and] unto the land of Egypt. And David smote the

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. So the Vulg.; Chald. and Syr. have: "there is nothing good for me, but I will escape," which is the rendering adopted by Erdmann. Very near this is the Sept. ἐὰν μή. It is more literally exact, but Eng. A. V. gives the sense.—It is not necessary to read כִּי אִם instead of כִּי.—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 1. Or, "desist from me." The idea of the word is "to give a thing up as impossible or useless."—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 2. The Art. is properly inserted as in Sept.; it is required by the connection and permitted by the Heb.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 2. The origin and meaning of these names are uncertain; conjectures may be found in the lexicons of Gesenius and Fürst. Hitzig's comparison of the Sept. form 'Αγχοῦς with 'Αγχίσης is groundless.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 3. Sept. has "wife of Nabal the Carmelite," and so Arab.; Syr., Vulg., and Chald., are ambiguous. The Greek text is supported by xxx. 5, and 2 Sam. ii. 2, and is probably to be preferred here.—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 8. So the Qeri; Kethib is "Girzites," both unknown names. Sept. has merely "Gesirites and Amalekites," whence Wellhausen supposes the Heb. "Geshurites" and "Gezrites" to be a duplet or double reading (by clerical error) of the same name, of which there are many examples in the Sept., but very few in the Heb. As the Sept. might easily have omitted one name accidentally or from not understanding it, and as the other VSS. all give three names (Syr. and Arab. putting "Gedola" for the second) it is better to retain the Heb. text.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 8. On this difficult clause see Erdmann in the Exposition. Instead of "as thou goest to," we may render "unto," "unto Shur and Egypt." On the text (which the VSS. treat variously) it may be remarked 1) that the אֲשֶׁר refers to the הָאָרֶץ, and Erdmann's translation "the land which they of old inhabited" is so far correct; 2) the sentence requires a name of a place instead of עוֹלָם, *a terminus a quo* to correspond to the *terminus ad quem*, and the parenthetic rendering of Erdmann "and David invaded . . . the Amalekites—for these were the inhabitants of the land, which (they inhabited) of old—as far as Shur and Egypt" is against the connection of the words, while the insertion of "they inhabited" after "which" is violent, and here not permissible.—If we provisionally read טֶלֶם (as some Grk. MSS. read and the Vat. MS. suggests), we may render: "David invaded . . . the Amalekites, for these inhabited the land which reached from Telem to Shur and to Egypt" (so Thenius and Wellhausen). By omitting אֲשֶׁר we get a simple sense: "for these inhabited the land of old, *etc.*" (so Syr. and Vulg., followed by Eng. A. V.); but, as Then. remarks, what is the propriety of referring here to the antiquity of these tribes?—Sept. (Vat.) here has a duplet.—Tr.]

land, and left [saved] neither man nor woman alive, and took away [*om.* away]
the[8] sheep and the oxen and the asses and the camels and the apparel, and returned
10 and came to Achish. And Achish said, Whither[9] have ye made a road [an inroad]
to-day? And David said, Against the south of Judah and against the south of the
11 Jerahmeelites and against the south of the Kenites. And David saved neither man
nor woman alive to bring *tidings* [*om.* tidings] to Gath, saying, lest they should tell
on us, saying, So did David, and so *will be*[10] his manner all the while he dwelleth
12 in the country of the Philistines. And Achish believed [confided in] David, say-
ing, He hath made his people Israel utterly to abhor him, therefore [and] he shall
be my servant forever.

[8] [Ver. 9. The Articles are here proper, because the Heb., though without the Art., supposes that all the animals and clothing were carried off.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 10. Instead of אַל several MSS. of De Rossi read אָן, which is safer (so Eng. A. V.). The MSS. and Edd. in the succeeding words waver between עַל and אֶל (as in ver. 8).—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 11. Syr., Chald., Arab. and some MSS., regard this clause as the word of the narrator, not of the informers, and this is better, since the informers would not express an opinion as to David's future conduct. Put a full stop after David, and render: "And this was his custom all the while he dwelt, *etc.*"—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

V. 1. *David flees to Philistia to king Achish of Gath.* That this is not the continuation of chap. xxiv. 23 [22], but of xxvi. 25, has already been established, against Thenius. In spite of Saul's renewed assurances that he would desist from his hostility, David, on account of his repeatedly exhibited vacillation in feeling and purpose, could no longer remain in the land of Judah; the event which he hints at in xxvi. 19, which his increased suffering (the explanation of which is given in chap. xxvi.) predicts, now occurs; he is obliged by Saul's renewed machinations (comp. ver. 4) to leave the country, to go to Philistia.* **And David said to his heart**="thought, reflected"—thus dramatically is David introduced, *taking counsel with himself* what he is to do in respect to Saul's continued hostility. The word "now" (עַתָּה) refers to his present dangerous position. **I shall now be carried off into Saul's hand**—not: "*by* the hand" (Keil, De W., and others). This expression: "into the hand" (בְּיַד שׁ׳) has led the ancient versions to modify the proper meaning of the verb "*snatch away*" into "He delivered" (Sept.), "fall" (Vulg.). [Cahen and Philippson render "perish by the hand;" *Bible Commentary:* "fall into the hand." The Niph. is used in the sense of "perish" in 1 Sam. xii. 25 (so Erdmann) and xxvi. 10—and this sense suits here, though the others are also good.—Tr.] **There is nothing good for me.**—That is, here, or, if I remain here, as the connection suggests. On account of this negation the כִּי is to be rendered simply "*but*" (Chald., Syr.), not "yea, I will flee" (Maur., De W.), nor "is it not better that I flee?" (Vulg.), nor (supplying אִם with Sept.), "there is nothing good for me, unless" (Thenius).—His *ground* for this determination: **Saul will desist from me ..... and I shall escape him** is borne out by the *result* (ver. 4 referring expressly back to these words). [See "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]—Ver. 2. The number six hundred has remained unchanged—xxv. 13; xxiii. 13; xxii. 2.—*Achish* is identical with the Achish of xxi. 10 sq. As a man persecuted by Achish's enemy, Saul, David might confidently hope to be received by him. The Philistine king Achish of 1 Ki. ii. 39 may be the same person—though he would then have reigned about fifty years, and must have been very old. He is the son of *Maachah*, this Achish the "son of *Maoch*," probably two forms of the same paternal name. *Gath* had been before conquered by the Israelites, (1 Sam. vii. 14), but appears here and xxi. 10 sq. as the residence of an independent king hostile to Saul. See 1 Chr. xviii. 1, which states that David afterwards conquered it. That the event here described is a different one from that in xxi. 10 sq. has been already there shown by pointing out the difference in the circumstances. There he is a solitary deserter, feigning madness to procure safety, being recognized as Goliath's conqueror. Here he appears in princely style with all his retinue, and so gains the confidence of Achish. Cler.: "The long enmity that Saul had shown him had made him acceptable to the enemies of the Hebrews and of Saul."—Ver. 3. The formal settling of this emigrant colony. Each of the warriors had a *family*, as appears from the words: **With his house.**—The same statement is found in 2 Sam. ii. 3. A little ambulant kingdom.—**His two wives.**—See xxv. 42–44. [These facts are mentioned to prepare the way for the narrative in chap. xxx. (*Bib. Com.*).—Tr.]—Ver. 4. See ver. 1. (Read Qeri יָסַף.) David gained his end by this immigration. [In Gath David seems to have studied music—see title of Ps. viii. (Ew.)—and may here have become acquainted with Ittai the Gittite, 2 Sam. xv. 19 (*Bible Com.*).—Tr.]

Vers. 5–7. *Achish gives David Ziklag as a residence.*—Ver. 5. **If I have found favor with thee.**—This is *presupposed* as a *fact* in this request. Achish regarded David and his band as allies against Saul, because he sought refuge with him from Saul. He must indeed, as Ewald (III. 137) well remarks, "long since have seen his er-

* [The reason why David goes to Philistia rather than to friendly Moab is perhaps partly because he would be more secure with this strong military nation (being no longer able with his large band, in which were many women and children, to hide or subsist in mountain-caves), and partly because he wished to be near his country, to help his people, or to take advantage of whatever might happen.—Tr.]

ror as to this strange man, and the more bitterly he regretted it, the more disposed he would now be to receive the distinguished leader of a considerable armed band, who was so often and so sorely persecuted by Saul." Grotius: "David's fame and the expectation excited by him must have been great, that a city..... should have been granted him for safety." **Give me one of the country-cities**.—David asked such a city as *property;* in ver. 6 it is expressly said that Achish gave it him for a possession. David's alleged *reason* for the request is that it was not suitable for him, Achish's *servant* and subject to remain in the capital city with his large retinue. The words do not support the explanation (Then.): "it is not fitting that I, who am as thou, a *prince*, should reside here with thee." The idea "to burden thee" (Buns.) is not contained in the expression "with thee," but is involved in the situation. [David subtly suggests the expensiveness of his presence in Gath; his real motive was to be out of the way of observation, so as to play the part of Saul's enemy without acting against him (*Bib. Com.*).—Tr.]—Ver. 6. *Ziklag* pertained first to Judah (Josh. xv. 31), then to Simeon (Josh. xix. 5), was afterwards taken by the Philistines, and perhaps remained uninhabited (Keil); according to xxx. 1 it lay far south near the Amalekite border. Its position in the Negeb (South country) has not yet been determined. According to Ritter (*Erdk.* XVI. 133) it was perhaps the present Tel el Hasy north-east of Gaza, "whence one enjoys a wide view, westward to the sea, eastward to the mountains of Hebron, northward to the mountains of Ephraim, and southward to the plains of Egypt." Comp. Raumer, § 225. Knobel conjectures that it was south-west of Milh, in Gasluj [Asluj], on the way to Abdeh (Rob. III. 154, 862 [Am. ed. II. 201]). This would put it much farther south. [See "Ziklag" in Smith's *Bible Dictionary.* Mr. Grove does not favor this identification.—Tr.] The remark that it consequently became the *property of the kings of Judah* confirms the view that the words **and he gave him** mean that the city was a *present* from Achish to David. Though the distinction between Judah and Israel appears already in the time of Saul and David (xi. 8; xvii. 52; xviii. 16; 2 Sam. ii. 9 sq.; iii. 10; v. 1–5; xix. 41 sq.; xx. 24), yet the phrase "kings of Judah" indicates that the narrative supposes the division of Israel into two kingdoms and the existence of the kingdom of Judah [so that this Book was composed between Solomon and the Babylonian exile.—Tr.]—Ver. 7. *A year and four months.* The first expression (יָמִים)= "some time, a considerable time," Gen. iv. 40; 1 Sam. xxix. 3, then="a year," Lev. xxv. 29; Judg. xvii. 10; 1 Sam. i. 3; ii. 19, *etc.** This exact statement of time attests the historical value of the narrative (Then., Keil).

Vers. 8–12. *David makes incursions from Ziklag* into the territory of the neighboring tribes on the south border of Palestine, returns *with rich booty*, and has the *confidence* of king Achish.—Ver. 8. **And he went up**, not "*he went out*" (De W., Keil); the tribes dwelt on higher ground than Ziklag, probably on the mountain-plateau of the northern portion of the wilderness of Paran. "*Invaded*" (פָּשַׁט), literally "spread themselves out;" the word is used especially of a hostile army (1 Chron. xiv. 9, 13), and so means to attack a city or land. (Here with אֶל, as xxx. 1; Judg. xx. 37,="to attack towards," with עַל it="*fall on*," as xxiii. 27; Judg. ix. 33, 44.)—The district of the *Geshurites* (to be distinguished from the little Aramæan kingdom of Geshur, 2 Sam. xv. 8; comp. 2 Sam. iii. 3; xiii. 37; xiv. 23, and from the northern Geshurites near Hermon on the border of Bashan (Gilead), Deut. iii. 14; Josh. xii. 5; xiii. 13) lay south of Philistia near the district of the Amalekites, along with which it is here named.—[Comp. Josh. xiii. 2, 3.—Tr.]—The *Gezrites* (Qeri) or Girzites (Kethib), a tribe not elsewhere mentioned, who, since the scene of David's incursions was the south of Philistia and Palestine, must not be identified (Grot., Ew.) with the inhabitants of *Gezer* (Josh. x. 33) in the west of Ephraim. Nor can we think of the *Gerrenni* (2 Mac. xiii. 24), inhabitants of the city Gerra between Rhinocoloura and Pelusium (Cler.), since this would carry us beyond the Arabian desert, in which the Gezrites at any rate dwelt.—[In Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, Art. "Gerzites," Mr. Grove, following Gesenius, Fürst, Stanley, suggests a connection between this people and the tribe which was connected with Mount Gerizim in central Palestine. This is an ingenious, though as yet unestablished conjecture.—Tr.]—Here, after Saul's war of extermination against them (xv. 7), the *Amalekites* had collected their scattered remnant and established themselves.—The* safest rendering of the following (very difficult) clause seems to be: "David . . . invaded . . . . the Amalekites (for these were inhabitants of the land, who inhabited it of old) as far as Shur and Egypt." The second verb "inhabited" is naturally to be supplied from the preceding participle ["inhabitants"]. David carried his incursions as far as Shur and the Egyptian border. That the Amalekites as nomads held this district is involved in xv. 7, where Saul is said to have smitten them "up to Shur, which is on the border of Egypt." Their old seats in the south of Palestine stretched into Arabia Petræa (Ex. xvii. 8 sq.; comp. Num. xiii. 29). The narrator here, in accordance with xv. 7, assumes this in the remark that David extended his incursions to Shur and Egypt. Perhaps he describes them as the *original inhabitants* of these regions with reference to their opposition to Israel in the Exodus (Ex. xvii. 8 sq.), and to their defeat by Saul (xv. 7), which, however, did not prevent their re-collection and settlement here. "To make military expeditions from Ziklag, at the best mere incursions for booty, was at that time a necessity for David and his men" (Ew.).†

* [Rashi and others, on the assumed ground that Saul reigned only two years, render "some days" (Philippson).—Tr.]

* [In the Germ. this paragraph follows the text-criticism below.—Tr.]

† *Text-criticism* of latter half of verse 8.—כִּי הֵנָּה יֹשְׁבוֹת is as to its gender (fem.) *const. ad sensum*, as if מִשְׁפָּחוֹת, *gentes, familiæ*, preceded. Expositors have dealt variously with the words אֲשֶׁר, *etc.* (which are attached to הָאָרֶץ), on account of the difficulties in them which centre in אֲשֶׁר. Thenius regards the אֲשֶׁר in the

Ver. 9. As nomads these tribes had large herds. —**He left neither man nor woman alive**; the reason for this is given in ver. 11. He needed the rich booty partly for the support of himself and his men, partly to retain and increase the king's favor. It was for this latter reason that, after his return from his expeditions, he went to Gath, instead of going immediately to Ziklag, in order to make report of his movements to Achish and deliver him a part of the spoil.—Ver. 10. The verb "*said*," like the "went up" in ver. 8, here expresses *customary*, repeated acting. The meaning is: Achish used to say: "Against whom have ye made an incursion this time?"* David's answer: **Against the south of Judah and against the south of the Jerahmeelites**, comp. xxx. 29, the posterity of *Jerahmeel*, the first-born of Hezron (2 Chron. ii. 9, 25), and so "one of the three great families of Judah descended from Hezron who probably dwelt on the southernmost border of the Tribe of Judah" (Keil), **and against the south of the Kenites** — who were under the protection of Judah (comp. xv. 5, 6; Judg. i. 16), mentioned along with Amalek in Num. xxiv. 21, where it is said of them: "in rocks thou hast put thy rest," referring to their dwellings in the rocks and caves south of Palestine, to which also their name points.*—All the tribes mentioned here and in ver. 8 dwelt near one another in the district bordering on the Negeb (south country) of Judah, and stretching between the hill country of Judah and the Arabian desert (see Josh. xv. 21). David's expeditions were really against the tribes named in ver. 8, who extended close into the south of Judah. It was his interest, however, to make Achish believe that he had made an expedition against Saul, and consequently against the men of Judah. He therefore says nothing of his incursion against the tribes named in ver. 8, which were on friendly terms with Achish (ver. 11), but declares that he has marched against the south of Judah, that is against the Israelites there and the tribes under their protection. This deception was made possible only by the fact that those tribes dwelt so near together that "that when the march began, no one could tell its destination" (Then.).—Ver. 11. Confirmation of David's endeavor to deceive Achish as to the object of his attack. **He spared neither man nor woman to bring them to Gath**, though he was accustomed to carry thither the richest booty. The narrator thus resumes the statement in ver. 9 in order to add the explanation: "he did not, as was the custom in war, carry them to Gath, but slew them, that he might not be betrayed by them to Achish." Contrary to the Masoretic accentuation a stronger punctuation mark is to be put after the words: **saying, lest they tell on us, saying, So did David** (Sept. Vulg., Maur., Then., Keil), since the following words: **And so was his manner all the while he dwelt in the land of the Philistines**, are naturally not a part of the preceding speech, but are the continuation of the narrator. מִשְׁפָּט = his constant, habitual *conduct*, as in vers. 8, 9.—Ver. 12 refers back to ver. 10; David's deception succeeded completely with Achish. From David's reports (which he received for pure coin), Achish drew two favorable considerations: 1) To preserve my favor and friendship, he has made himself thoroughly hateful to his people, or better (from the literal mean-

present text as inexplicable, since it is without connections, and thinks it strange that no *term. a quo* accompanies the *term. ad quem*, as is usual (Gen. x. 19, 30; Num. xiii. 21; xxxiv. 8; Judg. xi. 33), and, supposing the error to be in מֵעוֹלָם, he reads מִטֶּלֶם after the Sept. ἀπὸ Γελάμ, the latter word being taken as miswritten for Τελάμ. This reading would certainly give a simple and natural explanation, as Telem = Telaim (1 Sam. xv. 4) was on the south border of Palestine (Josh. xv. 24; 1 Sam. xv. 4 sq.), not far from the Amalekite territory, which Saul thence invaded. But to read *Telem* we must suppose a clerical error in the Sept.; and then all the other VSS. presuppose our Hebrew text. Perhaps the Sept. read wrongly מֵעֵילָם, and rendered it ἀπὸ Γελάμ, though elsewhere, as Thenius rightly objects, this word "Elam" is rendered by them Ἐλάμ or Αἰλάμ. For the rest we find בּוֹאֲךָ *without term. a quo* in Gen. xiii. 10 [where, however, a *term. a quo* is implied in the "garden of Egypt."—Tr.] Resort has been had to the omission of אֲשֶׁר; so the ancient VSS. [and Eng. A. V.] and Bunsen, who translates: "for these were of old the inhabitants of this land as far as," *etc.* But it is found in all codices, and its great difficulty makes a clerical error improbable. The example of the ancient VSS. is not authority for omitting it, since they often smooth down or go around difficulties. Seb. Schmid takes אֲשֶׁר מֵעוֹלָם as parenthesis: "they dwelt in the land, *which was of old*, as thou goest." But there was no need to state the antiquity of the land in itself. Keil takes אֲשֶׁר as adverb and בּוֹאֲךָ as Inf., so that the literal rendering would be: "where of old thy coming is to Shur;" that is, where of old one travels to Shur up to Egypt. But בּוֹאֲךָ in such geographical and local statements is always used in the sense of "as far as." Moreover, one does not see the reason for such a local statement here. If it means that of old the road to Shur or Egypt passed through this land, then the *term. a quo*, namely, Palestine, may easily be supplied from the context; but why this remark, when there was no other road to Egypt? And the suffix does not fit in with the "of old," because it would necessarily refer to *present* going. It seems safest with Ewald to regard the words from כִּי to מֵעוֹלָם as *parenthesis*—and to take the following as stating *how far* southward David pushed his incursions. [On this reading see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

* *Text-criticism.*—The אַל is difficult. To take it as particle of subjective negation, like μή—"ye went not out [*seid nicht ausgezogen*] to-day" (Gesenius, Keil), is unsatisfactory, since it cannot be supposed that Achish expected a negative answer (Then.). [Gesen. and Keil both take it as interrogative.—Tr.] De Wette's rendering; "did ye not make an incursion to-day?"—Aben Ezra's *nonne irruistis?* requires לֹא or הֲלֹא, for which אַל is never used. Maurer explains: *nihil hodie invasistis? sc. nullam in regionem hodie invasistis!* referring to xxx. 14, where also the verb is construed first with the Acc., and then with עַל. But to connect such an accusatival relation with אַל is unsafe, and the difficulty from the constant meaning of the latter remains. The reading אָן, *whither*, has therefore been adopted by some (Chald., Syr., Arab., R. Jesh., Rashi, D. Kimchi, Bunsen, *et al.*). But if a text-error *must* be assumed, it is better (following the Sept. ἐπὶ τίνα, Vulg. *in quem*) to suppose that מִי has fallen out, and instead of אַל to read אֶל (as in ver. 8), or עַל, which latter is preferable because of the עַל in David's answer (Then.)—עַל־מִי, "against whom?" So also R. Jonah and R. Levi.

* [The name, of uncertain origin, is surmised by Gesen. to mean "smith."—Tr.]

ing of the Heb. "stench,") made himself "*a loathing*" (comp. xiii. 12), and 2) completely alienated from his people, as their enemy, **he will now be my servant forever.** The word "forever" (עוֹלָם) refers to the present, when David already stood in the relation of vassal and dependent to Achish, who is now sure that he will always be subject to him.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. David's removal to Philistia, regarded in the light of his previous divine guidance, was a *self-willed act*, which had its *ground* in *little faith*, and produced *one sin after another*. Though a prophet, David had received the *divine command* to take up his abode not in a foreign land, but at home, in the land of Judah (xxii. 5). He disobeyed this command under the conviction that there was no escape for him from Saul but in Philistia. Hitherto in important undertakings and difficult positions he had repeatedly sought *the divine counsel and will* through God's word and through prayer to God. Here he proceeds in his own strength, and nothing is said of his inquiring of the Lord. He was certain of his *divine calling* as the *Anointed of the Lord;* he knew the *divine promises*, which could not lie; he had had most excellent experiences of the *divine deliverance* (xvii. 37) and the saving *power of the Lord;* and yet in the difficult position produced by Saul's persistent hate, he becomes timid and faint-hearted; in *littleness and weakness of faith* he goes his *own way*.

2. But, along with God's people's experiences of His goodness and faithfulness, there are manifestations of His punitive, chastening righteousness, as a witness against the unbelief and disobedience (and the connected unfaithfulness) which are concealed behind their littleness and weakness of faith. David was to feel painfully removal from association with God's people (xxvi. 19); as "Anointed of the Lord" he was to feel in his conscience the punishment of dependence on a heathen king, which he had himself assumed, and which was only externally somewhat softened by the somewhat freer position which his residence in Ziklag gave him; yet he found himself obliged in order to preserve the king's favor, to take a stand and maintain a conduct towards not only Saul but also his people, whereby he would appear to the heathen to be their enemy. Further, he saw himself forced into paths of untruthfulness and prevarication, and with king Achish to have recourse to trickery and lies.—F. W. Krummacher: "Was not David again guilty of open lying and denial of his people? In the eyes of God—undoubtedly. To himself David may indeed have attempted to justify himself by saying that his ambiguous language was only an allowable stratagem of war, and that *it was a heathen* to whom he veiled the truth. . . . But he will soon find out that God weighs those who will belong to Him in the scales of the Sanctuary, in which there is, among others, as weight-stone, the indestructible word: Thou shalt not bear false witness."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[Ver. 1. HALL: The over-long continuance of a temptation may easily weary the best patience, and may attain that by protraction which it could never do by violence. David himself at last begins to bend under this trial. . . . The greatest saints upon earth are not always upon the same pitch of spiritual strength: he that some time said, "I will not be afraid of ten thousands," now says, "I shall perish one day by the hand of Saul."—TR.]. Ver. 1 sq. SCHLIER: We suppose that when one has attained to faith, then everything must go on straight and smooth, that there must always be progress from faith to faith; and if it turns out otherwise, we suppose the whole has been only an appearance. He who so thinks knows neither the human heart nor human life.—STARKE: Even the heroic power of faith in the servants of God alternates with human weaknesses.—HEDINGER [from HALL]: "The best faith is but like the twilight, mixed with some degrees of darkness and infidelity.—Ver. 5 sq. SCHLIER: We suppose that when one comes to be of little faith, and in weakness enters upon wrong ways, now God's judgments would of necessity follow immediately, that now the Lord's chastening hand will take hold and by punishments re-establish the old faith. And it is true that in a case of unbelief things often happen so. But little-faith is not unbelief; the Lord helps the little-faith of His people in other ways. . . . The Lord goes after His children with love alone; and when one becomes weak in faith He first heaps up benefits upon him, and when one loses heart, He lets him find out what a faithful and thoroughly kind God he has.—Ver. 10 sq. HEDINGER [from HALL]: The infirmities of God's children never appear but in their extremities. [HALL: It is hard for the best man to say, how far he will be tempted. If a man will put himself among Philistines, he cannot promise to come forth innocent.—TR.].—BERL. B.: So one sin rises out of another; out of mistrust towards God comes fear of man, dissimulation and lying. [TAYLOR: Mark the prolific progeny that sprang from the one parent sin of unbelief in this dark chapter of David's life; prayerlessness; desertion of the sphere of duty; theft; murder; falsehood. All these have germinated from the one innocent-looking seed, loss of confidence in God.—TR.]

[Ver. 1. A good man *in a season of dejection*. He forgets past blessings and promises, ignores present mercies, exaggerates coming evils, forms unwise plans without consultation or prayer, and often involves himself in great difficulties, from which only some special providence can deliver. —TR.]

FOURTH SECTION.

Saul's Downfall in War with the Philistines.

Chapters XXVIII.—XXXI.

I. *David in the Philistine Expedition against Israel. Saul's Visit to the Witch of Endor.*

Chapter XXVIII. 1-25.

1 And it came to pass in those days that the Philistines gathered their armies[1]
together for warfare,[2] to fight with Israel. And Achish said unto David, Know
thou assuredly that thou shalt go out with me to battle [in the army],[1] thou and
2 thy men. And David said to Achish, Surely [Therefore] thou[3] shalt know what
thy servant can [will] do. And Achish said to David, Therefore will I make thee
keeper of mine head[4] for ever.
3 Now [And] Samuel was dead, and all Israel had lamented him and buried him
in Ramah, even[5] in his own city. And Saul had put away those that had familiar
4 spirits[6] and the wizards[7] out of the land. And the Philistines gathered themselves
together, and came and pitched in Shunem; and Saul gathered all Israel together,
5 and they pitched in Gilboa. And when Saul saw the host of the Philistines, he
6 was afraid and his heart greatly trembled. And when [*om.* when] Saul inquired
of the Lord [Jehovah], [*ins.* and] the Lord [Jehovah] answered him not, neither
by dreams, nor by Urim[8] nor by prophets.
7 Then said Saul [And Saul said] unto his servants, Seek me a woman[9] that hath
a familiar spirit, that I may go to her and inquire of her. And his servants said
8 unto him, Behold, there is a woman that hath a familiar spirit at Endor. And
Saul disguised himself, and put on other raiment, and he [*om.* he] went, and two
men with him, and they came to the woman by night; and he said, I pray thee,
divine unto me by the familiar spirit,[10] and bring me *him* [him] up whom I shall
9 name unto thee. And the woman said unto him, Behold, thou knowest what Saul
hath done, how he hath cut off those that have familiar spirits and the wizards out
of the land; wherefore, then, layest thou a snare for my life, to cause me to die.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. Literally "camps" (מַחֲנֶה). The same word in the last clause of this verse is rendered "battle [army]," and in ver. 19, "host [camp]."—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 1. Syr. adds: "to the ravine" (נחל), perhaps a repeated misreading of לְהִלָּחֵם. Sept. has ἐξελθεῖν, apparently taking צבא as Inf. in its original meaning "go forth."—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 2. Sept. "now" (עַתָּה inst. of אַתָּה), which is better.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 2. Sept.: "chief of the body-guard."—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 3. The ו is omitted in some MSS. and in Sept., Syr., Vulg.; it may be explained as appositional or epexegetical; but the omission is easier.—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 3. Usually now rendered "necromancers." So the Chald. (בִּדִין); Syr., Vulg. and Aq. have "magicians." —Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 3. This is a literal rendering of the Heb., which means: "those who know" (Eng. *wizard*—from the verb *wit*, "to know"), Erdmann "*die klugen leute*," so the Greek. Other VSS. render "sorcerers," which is the proper sense.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 6. The VSS. are troubled by this word. Sept. ἐν τοῖς δήλοις, Aq. ἐν φωτισμοῖς, Sym. διὰ τῶν δήλων, Syr. "by fire," Vulg. *per sacerdotes*. See the Exposition.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 7. אֵשֶׁת is the ordinary form of the construct. of אִשָּׁה. Here the relation expressed (lit. woman of a possessor of Ob) would be simply the appositional. The word may possibly be an absolute form, comp. Deut. xxi. 11. Erdmann: "a woman that hath a necromantic spirit."—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 8. De Wette, Philippson, Erdmann render "by necromancy" (*todtenbeschwörung*); but Ob is the spirit, not the art; Cahen: *par (l'esprit d') Ob*.—Tr.]

10 And Saul sware to her by the Lord [Jehovah], saying, As the Lord [Jehovah]
11 liveth, there shall no punishment[11] happen[12] to thee for this thing. Then said the
woman [And the woman said], Whom shall I bring up unto thee? And he said,
Bring me up Samuel.
12 And when [*om.* when] the woman saw Samuel, [*ins.* and] she cried with a loud
voice, and the woman spake [said] to Saul, saying, Why hast thou deceived me?
13 for[13] thou art Saul. And the king said unto her, Be not afraid; for [*om.* for][14]
what [*ins.* then] sawest [seest] thou? And the woman said unto Saul, I saw gods
14 [see a god][15] ascending out of the earth. And he said unto her, What form is he
of [is his form]? And she said, An old[16] man cometh up, and he is covered with
a mantle. And Saul perceived that it was Samuel, and he stooped with his face
to the ground, and bowed himself.
15 And Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted me, to bring me up? And
Saul answered [said], I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against
me, and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets
nor by dreams, therefore [and] I have called[17] thee that thou mayest make known
16 unto me what I shall do. Then said Samuel [And Samuel said], Wherefore, then,
dost thou ask of me, seeing the Lord [Jehovah] is departed from thee, and is be-
17 come thine enemy?[18] And the Lord [Jehovah] hath done to him[19] [for himself]
as he spake by me, for [and] the Lord [Jehovah] hath rent the kingdom out of
18 thine hand and given it to thy neighbor, *even* to David. Because thou obeyedst
not the voice of the Lord [Jehovah], nor executedst his fierce wrath upon Amalek,
19 therefore hath the Lord [Jehovah] done this thing unto thee this day. Moreover
[And] the Lord [Jehovah] will also [*om.* also] deliver Israel [*ins.* also][20] with thee
into the hand of the Philistines, and to-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me;
the Lord [Jehovah] also [*om.* also] shall [will] deliver the host [camp][1] of Israel
20 [*ins.* also] into the hand of the Philistines. Then [And] Saul fell straightway[21]
all along [his full length] on the earth, and was sore afraid because of the words
of Samuel; and there was no strength in him, for he had eaten no bread all the
21 day nor all the night. And the woman came unto Saul, and saw that he was sore
troubled, and said unto him, Behold, thine handmaid hath obeyed thy voice, and
I have put my life in my hand, and have hearkened unto thy words which thou
22 spakest unto me. Now therefore [And now], I pray thee, hearken thou also unto
the voice of thine handmaid, and let me set a morsel of bread before thee, and eat,
that thou mayest have strength when thou goest on thy way. But [And] he re-
23 fused, and said, I will not eat. But [And] his servants, together with the woman,
compelled[22] him [his servants compelled him, and the woman also], and he hear-

[11] [Ver. 10. Properly "iniquity" (עָוֹן), then its result, "blame" (Erdm., *schuld*), "punishment."—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 10. The Dagh. in the ק, which is merely euphonic, is omitted in very many MSS.—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 12. Lit.: "and thou art Saul," ו explanatory—"for." But we may render: why hast thou deceived me, and thou art Saul? Erdmann: *du bist ja Saul.*—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 13. The כִּי, which is here strange, may be—"but" in rapid excited talk. Sept. "say what thou sawest," where "say" is an obvious insertion. Other VSS. omit the כִּי (Vulg., Syr.).—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 13. So De Wette, Cahen, Philippson. Sept., Syr., Arab., Vulg. have Plu., as Eng. A. V. Chald.: "the angel of Jehovah." Erdmann has *geist.* See Exposition.—Tr.]

[16] [Ver. 14. Sept.: ὄρθιον, "upright;" they probably read זָקֵף for זָקֵן (Schleusner).—Tr.]

[17] [Ver. 15. The short (Waw consec.) form of the verb is found in 2 MSS.—Tr.]

[18] [Ver. 16. On the text-reading see the Exposition. Aq., Theod.: κατά σου, Sym. ἀντίζηλός σου.—Tr.]

[19] [Ver. 17. Vulg.: *faciet enim tibi Deus.* So Sept. and some MSS.: "to thee." The other VSS. are as the Heb., which is better maintained as the harder reading.—Tr.]

[20] [Ver. 19. The גַּם here is difficult, unless we render: "both Israel and thee." Otherwise the גַּם is without explanation, and would seem to be repeated from the third clause. Wellhausen thinks the first and third clauses identical, and omits the first because of the unintelligible גַּם. Yet the "camp" in the third clause seems to difference it from the first, and the conjunction may be explained as above or dropped. The Heb. text is supported by the VSS.—Tr.]

[21] [Ver. 20. Lit.: "hasted and fell," according to a common Heb. idiom, Ges. Gr. § 142. Sym.: ταχύ, Sept.: καὶ ἔσπευσε. In ver. 21 the Sept. renders by this same word the Heb. נִבְהַל, "troubled," whence Wellh. would read the latter word, but unnecessarily, for the present text gives a good sense, and Sept. might be right here, and wrong in ver. 21.—Tr.]

[22] [Ver. 23. Instead of וַיִּפְרְצוּ, some MSS. and EDD. have וַיִּפְצְרוּ. The former = "violently pressed on," the latter = "besought." The text, as the stronger and more vigorous, must be maintained.—Tr.]

kened unto their voice; so [and] he arose from the earth and sat upon[23] the bed
24 [bench]. And the woman had a fat [fatted][24] calf in the house; and she hasted
and killed it, and took flour, and kneaded it, and did bake unleavened bread
25 thereof; And she brought it before Saul and before his servants, and they did eat.
Then [And] they rose up, and went away that night.

[23] [Ver. 23. Many MSS. and EDD. read עַל inst. of אֶל, and so the ancient VSS. seem to have read. אֶל is difficult here.—Tr.]

[24] [Ver. 24. Sept. νομάς: Sym.: πεφιλοτροφημένη, Others: γαλαθηνόν.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1, 2. *A new war of the Philistines against the Israelites.* David is required by Achish to join the Philistine army with his band and take part in this war against his own people.—His indefinite and evasive answer.—**In those days**, namely, during David's stay in Philistia; giving the chronological connection with the preceding, in order to continue the narrative of chap. xxvii. —**The Philistines gathered their army**, a general summons throughout Philistia to the extreme north, where a battle was afterwards fought in the region of Jezreel,—"a general war of all the Philistine princes against Israel, in which David, as Philistine vassal-prince, was obliged to take part" (Ewald). "*In the army*" (בַּמַּחֲנֶה), not "*into the camp*" (S. Schmid, de W.), [Eng. A. V. freely "to battle"]. In David's answer the "thou shalt know" answers to Achish's formal "know thou" [same word in Heb.]. Thus is explained the [emphatic] "thou" (אַתָּה), for which there is no need to read with Sept. and Vulg. "now" (עַתָּה, Then.). לָכֵן is not *profecto* (Cler.), [so Eng. A. V. "surely"], but = "accordingly, therefore," "*cum ita sit s. ita videbis*" (Maur.). David gives not a definite, but an evasive answer, comp. xxix. 8. By Achish's demand, made in good faith, that he should go to battle against his people, David must have been thrown into a struggle of conscience, of which Achish had no suspicion. The latter therefore takes David's ambiguous answer, which seemed to promise the *action* which he required, as a definite declaration, and accordingly names him confidingly "keeper of his head," captain of his body-guard (Ew.). Here, as above, לָכֵן = "under such circumstances, therefore." The rendering "I *would* name thee" (Cler., Dathe) is untenable by reason of the context, especially the "for ever." That David actually went out *with* the Philistine army appears from xxix. 2 sq. The narrative in xxix. 1 sq. is the continuation of ver. 2. All between from ver. 3 is an episode, which (as appears especially from a comparison of ver. 4 with xxix. 1) is an insertion from a separate source, and therefore is an independent narrative, which is not in necessary connection with the preceding and succeeding context.

Ver. 3. *Introductory statement* 1) *of Samuel's death*, not from a second source, but here inserted by the redactor from xxv. 1 to introduce what follows. The verbs are pluperfect in sense. **And they had buried him at Ramah, namely or, that is, in his city.** The ו [= and, namely] is *explicative*, as in 2 Sam. xiii. 20; Am. iii. 11; iv. 10 (Ges. § 155, 1 a). Its omission in Sept., Vulg., Syr., is explained by the difficulty that it occasioned the translators. 2) *Of Saul's expulsion of the witches and soothsayers* (long before this). Saul *had* put away, *expelled* the *necromancers* (הָאֹבוֹת) and the wise men (הַיִּדְּעֹנִים) [wizards], the soothsayers. On the various meanings of the word *Ob* [Eng. A. V. familiar spirit] see Böttcher, *de inferis*, I., pp. 101-108. Most moderns connect it with *ob* (אוֹב), "leather bag," which is found in the Plural in Job xxxii. 19. We cannot, however, thence render the word with the Sept. "*ventriloquist*" (ἐγγαστρίμυθος), because, as Diestel (*Herz.*, XVII., 482) remarks, the representation of soothsaying or sorcery as ventriloquism would destroy the appearance of the supernatural, and it cannot be shown that ventriloquists as such were accounted sorcerers. As the word in Isa. viii. 19, xxix. 4 expresses a dull, hollow, groaning sound, "it is best to suppose a stem אוּב, the softened form of the Arab. [גּוּף] = "to be hollow," and *Ob* is then the "hollow thing" (bag), and so "one who speaks hollow" (Diestel *ubi sup.*). In conjurations of the dead it is the dull, hollow, mysterious tone of the voice, which was personified and represented as a mysterious being, whether as the spirit of the departed speaking from the depth of the earth (Isa. xxix. 9), or as the spirit dwelling in the conjuror, man or woman (Lev. xix. 31; xx. 6, 27), and, finally, the necromancers or speaking soothsayers themselves were so called, as here and 2 Kings xxiii. 24. The "wise people" [wizards] (יִדְּעֹנִים), always connected with the Oboth or necromancers, are those that deal in necromancy through sorcery and soothsaying; the simple expression in our [German] popular language, "wise woman" [so Eng. wizard—Tr.] rests on the same idea of a knowledge of what is concealed and future by mysterious means. In his passionate zeal for the Law, urged on by an unquiet conscience, Saul had driven the necromancers and soothsayers out of the land (Lev. xix. 31; xx. 27, comp. Deut. xviii. 10 sq.), that he might thus show himself a zealous theocratic king and win God's favor. This statement is appended to that of Samuel's death as a superscription, as it were, to bring out the sharp contrast of the following narrative of Saul's conduct.

Vers. 4-25. *Saul and the witch of Endor.*

Ver. 4. The camp of the Philistines was in *Shunem*, Josh. xix. 18, which signifies, according to Ges., "two resting-places" (= שׁוּנֵים); according to Eusebius it was also called *Shulem*, which is confirmed by the present name, for it is the same place that is now called *Solam* or *Sulem* (Rob.,

III., 402 [Am. ed., ii., 324]), on the western declivity of *little Hermon** [Jebel Duhy], the home of Abishag (1 Kings i. 3), and of the woman that often entertained Elisha, whose son he restored to life (2 Kings iv. 8–37; viii. 1, 6). [*Bib.-Com.:* The Philistines either advanced along the sea-coast, and then entered the valley of Jezreel from the west—the same route, only in the opposite direction, as that taken by the Midianites, who, coming to the valley of Jezreel from the Jordan, penetrated as far as Gaza (Judg. vi. 4, 33)—or else they came by the present road right through Samaria, starting from Aphek.—Tr.] Only about *four miles* thence Saul had gathered the host of Israel, which was encamped on *Gilboa*, that is, the mountain range in the territory of Issachar, which traverses the south-eastern part of the plain of Jezreel from Zerin to the Jordan-valley, into which it sinks precipitously at Bethsan. There is now there a village called Jelbon (Rob. III. 404 [Am. ed., ii. 316]). The two armies were therefore encamped on the two groups of mountains that enclosed the broad plain of Jezreel toward the east, or, more precisely, the south-east, between which stretched a valley-plain. From an elevation of about twelve hundred feet Saul could see the Philistine camp, which was only four miles distant.†

Ver. 5. The sight fills him with *fear and great dread*, because he had a bad conscience towards the Lord, and therefore could not be sure of His help, not merely because he saw that the Philistine army was so unexpectedly numerous (Cler.).—Ver. 6. Yet in his anxiety he had recourse to "*inquiring of the Lord;*" he wished thereby to learn what he was to do, and also the fate of himself and his army. **But the Lord answered him not**, the reason for which see in xv. 26, comp. xiv. 37.—The threefold גַּם [also] puts in one line the *three means* of inquiry of the Lord (on the repetition of גַּם to connect things related or similar, "both . . . and" in pos. sentences, "neither . . . nor" in neg., see Ew., § 359): *Dreams, Urim* (and Thummim) and *Prophets.*‡ The phrase "inquire in" (שָׁאַל בְּ) is commonly used of inquiry by Urim and Thummim, with which the two other modes are here connected. The "*dreams*," the first means of the revelation of the divine will, are not dreams by *incubations* at a holy place (Ew.), "to which nothing here or elsewhere points" (Then.), nor the dreams of *those that receive* the revelation, but the *dreams of mediating persons*, through whom the Lord was inquired of; these might be and were sometimes prophets, comp. Num. xii. 6 with Jer. xxiii. 25, 32, and Deut. xiii. 2 sq., where the *false prophets* with their lying dreams are opposed to the true—but might also be *unprophetic* persons, as in Joel iii. 1. Here in our passage the persons who have revelations in dreams are distinguished from the "*prophets.*" In the order of arrangements of these three vehicles of revelation there is a progression from the less to the greater, since in the Old Testament a subordinate position is certainly assigned to the *dream* as the medium of divine influence on the inner life, which in sleep loses the power of self-manifestation and sinks into a state of the extremest passivity.—*Urim* is the abbreviation of *Urim and Thummim* (Ex. xxviii. 30; Num. xxvii. 21), which, as the *high-priestly medium* of inquiring the divine will, stands between the *revealing-dreams* and the *prophetic testimony*. But since the murder of the priests in Nob the external apparatus, the *Ephod* with the Urim and Thummim had been in David's camp, xxii. 20 sq., xxiii. 6, xxx. 7; and nothing is anywhere said of another high-priest than Abiathar, who had fled to David. Thenius thence concludes that this section contradicts the narrative of chap. xxiii., since Saul could have gotten no answer at all through Urim and Thummim, because these could have been only in *one* place. But this is not certain; after the catastrophe at Nob Saul may well have had a new Ephod with Choshen [Breastplate] and Urim and Thummim prepared (Keil), and this is the more natural from Saul's independent mode of procedure in matters of religious service, and the probability that in his heated theocratic zeal he did not suffer the public service at the tabernacle to cease after the murder of the priests. (It is possible also that a copy of the Ephod with the Urim and Thummim had been left behind when Abiathar fled.) As to the high-priest, apart from the possibility of inquiring by Urim and Thummim without him (it is done apparently without a priest by Saul, xiv. 37, and *David*, xxiii. 9–12), it is to be observed that in the first years of David's government the tabernacle is at Gibeon with Zadok, son of Ahitub of the line of Eleazar, as high-priest, which can be explained only by supposing that Saul had removed the tabernacle and the national worship thither from Nob, and that there were two high-priests, who, indeed, are frequently mentioned, 2 Sam. viii. 17; xv. 24, 29, 35; 1 Chron. xv. 11; xviii. 16. We may thence conclude that Saul chose a high-priest from the high-priestly race of the line of Eleazar. It is further to be remarked that in Saul's own words, ver. 15, this inquiry by Urim is not mentioned. In 1 Chron. x. 14 it is said that he was slain by the Lord because he did *not* inquire of the Lord. The contradiction is only apparent; he gave over the true, right inquiry, in that, his first questioning, which was not with upright, humble heart, having been unanswered, he betook himself to a necromancer, instead of penitently applying to God.—**By the prophets**. Intercourse between Saul and the prophets had doubtless been broken off since the beginning of Saul's persecution of David (xix.), while it had continued between David and the prophets, as far as circumstances permitted (xxii. 5 sq.). But in his anxiety and despair Saul had now again turned to them for aid. Proof that application was made to prophets not only in great theocratical matters, but also in personal affairs, is found in ix. 6 sq.; 1 Kings xiv. 1 sq.; 2 Kings i. 3.—Saul received from God no answer more, except for judgment.—Ver. 7. Instead of humbling himself before God, he turns with hardened heart and bad conscience to the superstitious means, that the law of God

* [This incorrect name comes from a misunderstanding of Ps. lxxxix. 12 (13).—Tr.]

† [According to Stanley (*Sin. and Pal.*, IX., ii. 3) Saul was stationed nearly on the site of Gideon's camp. See Art. "Gilboa" in Smith's *Bib.-Dict.*, and Hackett's note, Amer. Ed.—Tr.]

‡ [Bp. Patrick notes that the same three classes are mentioned in Iliad i. 62.—Tr.]

had forbidden (Lev. xix. 31). Making accomplices of his servants, he gets information through them of a necromancer. (אֵשֶׁת, appositional construct without Genitive relation, Ges. § 116, 5, see Josh. xxxvii. 22; Jer. xiv. 17.) "*A woman mistress of Ob*," = "a woman who is in *possession* of an Ob," that is, of a spirit (comp. Lev. xx. 27) by which the dead are conjured up, in order that they may disclose the present and the future. They inform him of such a one who dwells at *Endor*. Endor was on the northern declivity of Little Hermon, four and three-fourths Eng. miles south of Tabor, nine and a half miles south-east of Nazareth, about twelve miles north of Gilboa, so that Little Hermon lay between; there is still a place of the same name on the declivity of the mountain, Jebel Duhy. Rob. III. 1, 486 [*Am. ed.* ii. 360].—[Endor, = "fountain of the dwelling," is still marked by a spring and numerous caves fit for the abode of witches (Thomson). For descriptions of the circumstances of this incident see Stanley's *Hist. of the Jewish Church*, II. 30 sq., *Sinai and Pal.* p. 328–334 (*Eng. ed.*), Porter in Murray's *Handbook for Syria and Pal.* ii. 355 sq., Thomson's "*Land and Book*," ii. 161.—Tr.]—Ver. 8. **Saul disguised himself**, namely, by putting on other clothes so as not to be recognized by his royal dress and insignia, especially as he was treading a path forbidden by himself. **At night** he went thither, in order to escape the notice of his own people and of the enemy's posts, which were not far off; he was accompanied by **two men** to show him the way and act as guard. A dreadful journey, a terrible night, both symbols of Saul's condition, lost on the way of inner self-hardening and thorough self-darkening.—Saul's request: **Divine for me by necromancy** [properly: "by the Ob, the spirit," as in Eng. A. V.—Tr.]. The word "*divine*" (קָסַם) commonly occurs in a bad sense of the predictions of false prophets, comp. Deut. xviii. 10, 14; 2 Kings vii. 17; 1 Sam. vi. 2 (in a good sense in Isa. iii. 2;* Prov. xvi. 10 [the subst.]). On its meaning see Hengst., *Bileam*, p. 9 sq. Anm.†—Ver. 9. The woman does not recognize Saul, as is plain from ver. 12. Her words show that Saul's order for the extirpation of this superstition had been vigorously carried out. (Thenius: הַיִּדְּעֹנִי may be Sing. Col. (Böttch.), but all the VSS. and twenty-three MSS. supply the Plu. ים, which may easily have fallen out through the following מִן.)—Necromancy was forbidden on pain of death (Ex. xxii. 18; Lev. xix. 31; xx. 27; Deut. xviii. 10, 11). The woman supposes that the stranger is putting her to the test, in order to kill her according to the king's law and command; and this indicates that it was in this way that the law of extermination of witches was carried out. In the earliest period of the monarchy, as fruit of Samuel's labors, we see a worship purified from all idolatry, and an energetic zeal against everything connected with idolatry, including this sort of superstition.—[This statement is too broad; idolatry probably existed all along in Israel. Comp. Judg. xviii. 30, 31; 1 Sam. xix. 13.—Tr.] So much the more despicable is Saul's present action.—Ver. 10 sq. Saul swears to her that no harm shall thereby come to her: "by the Lord;" "an oath which shows how completely hardened Saul was" (Keil). Not till he has given this oath does the woman ask: **Whom shall I bring up to thee?** which is in two respects significant: 1) in that the witch thereby claims to have sovereignty, as it were, over the whole realm of the dead, and 2) in that these words indicate the business-like routine of the witch in her soothsaying and conjuration, and have precisely the tone of the modern small dealer: "what do you wish? and how can I serve you?"—Thenius supposes that the woman thus obtained from Saul the promise that she should not be punished for what he (already recognized by her as the king) should hear from her; but this view rests on the unfounded assumption that the woman had *certainly* known *beforehand* from the servants (who had directed Saul to her) of this visit, and must have recognized the visitor, if not by his attendants, yet by his extraordinary bodily size. From the narrator's account we cannot doubt that his view was that Saul came as an unknown person to the woman. And the woman's whole conduct, ver. 12, permits no other opinion. His height need not have betrayed him to her; it was night, and he was disguised; his anxiety, his age and his disguise all permit us to suppose that he was somewhat bowed and bent.—Saul's demand: **Bring me up Samuel** (and so the woman's question) supposes (the word "*up*" involves it) that the dead dwelt not in the grave, in the pit, but (as buried) dwelt under the earth in *Sheol*, that is, a large, broad space which received and claimed (from שָׁאַל, comp. Prov. xxvii. 20; Ps. vi. 6 [5]) all the dead without distinction, godly and ungodly—dwelt in a realm of the dead. The contrast to this realm of the dead beneath the earth is heaven above the earth, where dwells the Lord with the host of angels. The superstition in question consisted in the fact that it was believed that by conjuration the dead were compelled to rise from the depth of Sheol to the surface of the earth, and answer questions put to them. It seems from Ex. xxii. 18; Lev. xx. 27, that women often practiced this necromancy, to which fact Winer conjectures the Fem. Plu. form Oboth to refer (*W.-B.* II. 626, A. 4). The usual operations or formulas of conjuration, which the woman no doubt employed after the above business-conversation, are not specially mentioned by the narrator, being irrelevant and of purely technical significance, but belong between vers. 11 and 12. Böttcher conjectures, but unnecessarily and without ground, that a verse has here fallen out, which mentioned the necromantic apparatus, and stated that the woman went out into a court

* [Not necessarily here in the good sense, more probably it and "prophet" are intended to describe all classes of predictions.—Tr.]

† קָסֳמִי, Kethib, קָסֳמִי, Qeri, comp. Ew. § 40 *b*: the O-sound is sometimes so pressed by new endings that it recedes to a foregoing vowelless consonant, and is sometimes repeated with two adjacent consonants, as כָּתָבְךָ. In such cases we find the half-vowel echo O° in the same syllable (commonly found only with gutturals), generally with ק, and in a loosely connected syllable as here. Comp. Judg. ix. 8.

or garden. Such a supplement is not at all needed for the understanding of the affair. In support of this view Böttcher adduces the words: "and the woman came" of ver. 21, and the necessity of a large space for the exhibition of a gigantic figure; to which Thenius rightly replies that we need not regard the figure indicated by the "Elohim" [God, ver. 13] as a *gigantic* one, and that nothing is said in the account of exhibiting it.—Ver. 12. "*She saw*" (וַתֵּרֶא), not: "she acted as if she saw" (Then.). Render: **When the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice.**—According to this the cause of her outcry was the sight of the apparition of Samuel. The following words: **And the woman said to Saul, Why hast thou deceived me, for thou art Saul?** indicate that the woman at the same time recognized Saul in the Unknown; this discovery naturally reminded her of her danger as violator of the king's prohibition. She thinks herself deceived, tricked and given over to death. There is hardly any doubt, therefore, that this sudden perception of her danger, together with Samuel's apparition, was the cause of the terror which was expressed in her outcry. *How* she came to recognize the king in the Unknown, is not indicated in the words. Thenius, assuming that she already knew with whom she was dealing, supposes that, as she simulated fear at the alleged apparition, she now pretended that her sudden recognition of Saul came through supernatural influence, through Samuel indeed. But the text gives no support to the assumption on which this explanation rests. Ewald supposes that she burst out into a loud cry on seeing Samuel's shade, because it ascended with such frightfully threatening gestures as it could have used only against its deadly enemy, that is, Saul, and she thence saw that the questioner must be Saul. But the words give no reason at all to suppose that this was the view of the narrator. Keil holds that the woman had fallen into a state of clairvoyance, in which she could recognize persons who, like Saul, were unknown to her by face. Is there not, however, a simpler explanation, partly psychological, partly suggested by the context, both of her seeing Samuel's form and recognizing Saul? As to the former, so much is clear from the connection, that only the woman, not Saul, saw Samuel; this appears from Saul's question, vers. 13, 14: "What seest thou? what is his form?" She then describes the apparition, in order to leave to Saul its identification with Samuel (ver. 14 *b*). That the woman went out of the room in which she was at first with Saul, into another, is not said, and is not to be inferred from the words: "she came to Saul." Therefore in the same room she sees Samuel's apparition, and Saul does not see it. This can be explained psychologically only as by an *inner vision*, the occasion for which was given by Saul's request to bring up Samuel, and the psychological foundation of which was her inward excitement, in connection with her lively recollection of Samuel's form, which was well known to her from his earthly life, and stood before her mind in vividest distinctness. So Tanchum explains it: "She saw Samuel not with the eyes, but with the aid of the imagination, inwardly, in his *well-known* form." And her recognition of Saul just at this moment would be psychologically explained as the product of her inward perception of Samuel (occasioned by Saul's request), and of her recollection of the relation in which she knew Saul had stood to Samuel and of the prophetic sentence of punishment which Samuel had pronounced against Saul. When now, at this moment, so full of danger for all Israel, she saw before her the mysterious Unknown, who was come through her to question Samuel concerning the impending battle, and who on a nearer view, despite his disguise, made on her by the mysterious character of his personality, the impression of an extraordinary person, she could, by her intensified power of perception, straightway recognize him as Saul, and must needs then be seized with the terror of which the account tells.—Ver. 13. Saul calms her deadly fear.—**Fear not**, that is, concerning thy life.—The question: **What seest thou?** supposes 1) that *he* did not see what *she* saw; 2) that she was with him in the same room in which the foregoing conversation had occurred, and 3) that on account of the manipulations usual in such conjurations, she was yet necessarily at some distance from him. She answers: **I see Elohim ascending out of the earth.**—The word "Elohim" signifies here not a *plurality* of appearances (*Gods*, Sept., Vulg., Syr., Arab.—or spiritual beings, ghosts, Tremell.—or several devils, one of whom took the form of Samuel, S. Schmid—or angels, Chald., Theod.), but, despite the [Heb.] Plu. predicate (עֹלִים, "ascending," by attraction from the Plu. subst.), a single appearance, as is evident from the Sing. pronoun, "*his* form," a spiritual appearance belonging to the region of the super-terrestrial, the superhuman, a fear- and terror-producing spiritual appearance. The word is here employed in a sense "for which the idea of divinity is too restricted, the general, vague idea of the not-earthly, not-human" (Hengst., *Beit.* II. 255). But Thenius also rightly connects with it the idea of the terror-inspiring from the fact that the simple Heb. sounds *alah* (אָלָה), from which the word is made, are the involuntary sounds of astonishment and fear, referring to Gen. xxxi. 42, where the "*fear* of Isaac" stands along with the "*God* of Abraham."*—Ver. 14. Saul's second question: **What is his appearance, his form?** The woman's answer gives an exacter description of the spiritual appearance which she saw in her visionary state: **An old man cometh up, and he is covered with a mantle.**—The *meil* (מְעִיל) is the talar-shaped garment [reaching to the ankles.—TR.], the prophet's mantle, which Samuel wore in his life-time (xv. 27), and in which the woman and Saul would necessarily remember him. Still we have no hint that Saul saw the appearance that was visible to the

* [Whatever may be the original meaning of the stem (אלה), the reasoning of Thenius, endorsed by Erdmann, is very unsafe. We know too little of primeval onomatopoeia to base etymologies on it. The example of Gen. xxx. 42 cannot be decisive for the original meaning of Elohim, and, if it were, the actual historical meaning is a question of use, not of etymology. Now "Elohim" is elsewhere in the Old Testament used only of "god" and "judges or kings."—TR.]

woman. It is said of him only that "from this description he recognized the form seen by the woman to be *Samuel*, and to do him reverence bowed down to the ground."

Vers. 15–20. *Conversation of Samuel and Saul.* Ver. 15. **And Samuel said**, that is, *the woman* (Tanchum) spoke from the place where she was standing in hollow, dull tones, which Saul supposed to be Samuel's, perhaps in the manner of ventriloquists, the natural result of her excited visionary state, in which she identified herself with Samuel.—**Why dost thou disquiet me,** disturb me (comp. Isa. xiv. 9), to bring me up? These words prove that the narrator assumes the previous employment of arts of conjuration, and exclude the supposition (left undecided by Keil, adopted by other expositors) that Samuel's ascent is represented as produced by miraculous power of God. They also refute the opinion of these expositors, that Samuel's apparition rose *before* the woman had employed her art, and that therefore there is no employment of magic means between vers. 11 and 12. Rather the view that there was such magic art in this place (between vers. 11 and 12) is confirmed by these words of Samuel: "why dost thou disquiet me?" namely, by the woman's conjurations. *Saul's answer* gives his reason for this disturbance of the dead as follows: 1) I am in great straits from the Philistines, who are warring against me; 2) God has left me, and answers me no more; 3) I wish to know what to do, I am at a loss and uncertain about the future. **So I have had thee called* to tell me what I shall do.**—According to the preceding words: "*God* has left me and answers me no more," Saul cannot regard the answer which he asks from Samuel as God's revelation and declaration; in fact there is in his words a contrasting, or at least a distinction between the divine revelation no longer granted him and the supernatural magic-gotten answer which he expects from Samuel. And yet Samuel was the prophet of the Lord and His organ. This is the contradiction to which Samuel's answer, ver. 16, refers. The contradiction is not that Saul asks from Samuel a divine announcement, while he yet says there is no longer any such answer for him (Keil).—Ver. 16. Samuel's answer: **Why dost thou ask me, since the Lord has left thee and become thy enemy?†** That is: if the Lord has left thee, why dost thou apply to me, the *Lord's instrument?*

Vers. 17–19 contain the *confirmation of Saul's previous sentence of rejection and the announcement of his impending fate.* Ver. 17. The declaration of the *fact* that the Lord, according to His counsel and determination (עָשָׂה לוֹ, "hath done for Himself" [Eng. A. V.: wrongly "to him"]), has taken the kingdom from him and given it to David. **The Lord hath done for himself.**—Pleonastic Dative, not unmeaning = has done according to His will, or to carry out His purpose, "to show His truth" (*Berl. Bib.*). The reading "to thee" (לְךָ) in Sept., Vulg. and some MSS. cited by Thenius (Cod. Kenn. 155, 246; De Rossi 305, 679, 716 [orig.]) is suspicious from its allusion to xv. 26, 28, and because it seems to be an attempt to interpret and smoothen the text, though an original ך [thee] might easily be copied as ו [him], and the latter so come into the traditional text. **As he spake by me.**—Comp. xv. 23. It is remarkable that while in that passage Saul's obstinate rebellion, through which he loses the kingdom, is equalled with the gross sin of sorcery, here in the act of committing this superstitious sin (against which he had shown such bloody zeal), the judgment of inward self-hardening being then finished, he again hears the sentence, and learns with terror that the complete realization and definite fulfilment of the divine decree of rejection is now at hand. The whole declaration of ver. 17 is the factual explanation and confirmation of the words of ver. 16: "The Lord is departed from thee and is become thy enemy, thy oppressor."—Ver. 18. The *reason* is stated, namely, Saul's disobedience (as in xv. 23). "This thing" is this strait or distress. Comp. "I am sore distressed," ver. 15. The Perf. עָשָׂה [hath done] is to be understood, like the preceding Perfects, of what has happened, and is settled. This Philistine distress, with its immediate results, is God's act in complete fulfilment of the judgment against him.—Ver. 19. Announcement of impending misfortune for himself, his house and his people in battle with the Philistines. **And the Lord will deliver Israel also with thee,** *etc.*—"Will deliver" (יִתֵּן) again indicates the act of God in accord with His holy and righteous *will*, and is to be taken (with Keil) as voluntative; *with* the *king*, on whom the judgment falls by the Philistine, the judgment will reach the people also, on account of the ethical and theocratical

* On the ָה parag. instead of ָה, for strengthening, see Ew. §228 c, A. 1.

† עָר—"enemy," occurs elsewhere only in Psalm cxxxix. 20, a Psalm which undoubtedly contains some *Aramaic* words and forms, and in Dan. iv. 16 as a Chaldee word—not in Psalm ix. 7 and Isa. xiv. 21, where the form is to be otherwise explained. We might take the word as Aramaic form of צָר, the interchange of Heb. צ and Aram. ע being not infrequent, like γ and ξ in Greek (examples in Ges. under letter ע *n.* 3); and though there is no other Aramaic form in this section, and the word צָר (for עָר) appears with this signification mostly in poetry (Job xxxvi. 16; Lam. i. 5, 7, 10), yet the prophetical style (as here) is not far removed from the poetical, and צר might be used here as well as in Num. x. 9, which is not properly poetical; the Aramaic change of צ into ע might easily come by error in copying. The use of צָר might be explained as a designed reference to צַר־לִי in ver. 15. But the absence of לְ before עָרֶךָ makes a difficulty, הָיָה never occurring in such a construction without it; though, while unexampled, it would not be ungrammatical (Maur.). We should expect לְעָרֶךָ. Does not this then cast suspicion on the whole expression, especially as עָרֶיךָ in Psalm cxxxix. 20 is not assured? It is certainly surprising and noteworthy that Sept.: *καὶ γέγονε μετὰ τοῦ πλησίον σου*, and Vulg.: *transierit ad æmulum tuum* [in Ps. cxxxix. Sept. πόλεις, Vulg. *adversarii*—Tr.], render (comp. Syr., Ar.) as if they read וי׳ עִם רֵעֶךָ—"and is with thy neighbor," which Then. thence adopts as the true reading. These translations may indeed be mere conjectural paraphrases (Keil), or may have had in mind the לְרֵעֲךָ of the following verse and the parallel passage, xv. 28 (Maur.). It is hard to decide, the *pros* and *cons* being so nearly balanced.

solidarity [organic oneness] which exists between him and them; the Lord will subject them to th Philistines. **And to-morrow wilt thou and thy sons be with me**—dead, with me the dead, in the Underworld; "with me" in the kingdom of the dead, in *Sheol*. Hence it appears that besides self-consciousness (which indeed was conceived of as sunken into a sleep or dream-like state), that is, besides the continued existence of the personality after death, a union after death in Sheol was believed in; at the same time it hence appears that in the realm of the dead the good and evil were *not* thought to be separated. Thenius would read with the Sept. "thou and thy sons with thee shall fall," on the ground that the Heb. text *strangely* first speaks of the Israelites, then descends to the *Underworld*, then returns to the *camp* of the Israelites, while the Sept. text presents a perfectly good order: first the *general*, the defeat; then the *particular*, the death of Saul and his sons; and finally the *result*, the plundering of the camp. But the arrangement is excellent in our text, which says nothing else than what the Sept. periphrastically expresses: "to-morrow thou and thy sons will be *dead*," and then the *Underworld* is by no means put in the same line with the Israelites and their camp, but Israel's renewed defeat, the death of Saul and his sons, and the complete destruction of the camp of Israel, are mentioned as the three decisive blows in the judgment which should fall on Saul.—Ver. 20. Up to this point Saul had remained in his reverential posture as stated in ver. 14; now under the powerful impression of these words he falls suddenly to the ground, and lies *his full length* on the earth. The cause is stated to be: 1) his terror at Samuel's words, and 2) his weakness, resulting from the fact (of course from inward excitement), that *he had taken no food the whole* (preceding) *day and the whole night*.

Vers. 21–25. *Saul's entertainment by the woman.* The words "and the woman came" do not in themselves justify the opinion (Then., Diestel in Herz. XVII. 482, *et al.*) that the woman had been in another room, nor is there any hint of this elsewhere in the narrative. The words of the woman (vers. 21, 22) show a talkativeness characteristic of this class of women, and a certain humor, particularly in the contrasting of her obedience to his command and the obedience which she now requires from him for his good, in the introductory words, "and now hearken thou also." **That thou mayest have strength when thou goest on thy way.**—These words express neither *apprehension*, nor the fear that he would die *on her hands*, and it would then go hard with her, and her prediction would not be fulfilled (Then.); they exhibit merely her natural sympathy with her guest, worn out by excitement and abstinence from food, which prompts her to offer him her hospitality.—Ver. 23 sq. The further minute description of the proceedings of Saul and his servant and the woman is so domestically and psychologically true to life, that the historical trustworthiness of the narrative is put beyond all doubt. Saul refuses to take food because he is full of fear and terror. The servants and the woman force him—he suffers himself to be persuaded. Till now he has lain on the ground; now he gets up and seats himself on the divan (מִטָּה [Eng. A. V. not so well: "bed"—Tr.], "the cushioned bench, which extends along the wall of the room, still found in the East" (Then.). She kills a fatted calf and bakes unleavened cakes. "She kneaded" where we need not supply "*it*," since the words describe the operation of kneading. **She baked it as unleavened** loaves or cakes, because she was obliged to hurry.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. *The theocratic and biblical-theological significance* of the history of Saul's visit to the Witch of Endor is to be judged and determined, first in respect to the representation of *the condition of departed souls after death*, then as to *the religious-moral facts* which come under consideration from the Old Testament standpoint of revelation and from the theocratic point of view, and finally as regards *Saul's state of heart in respect to God and the people.* In respect to the *state of departed souls* after death we have the representation not merely of their continuance in personal identity, but also of a self-conscious existence, which is conceived of as a condition of slumber-like rest, from which there may be a rousing and raising; yet such a disturbance is regarded as a disquieting. The abode of the departed, in contrast with heaven as the throne of God and the dwelling of the heavenly powers, is thought to be a wide space deep under the earth (comp. Deut. xxxii. 22; Ps. lxxxvi. 13; lxiii. 10 (9); Ezek. xxvi. 20), not the narrow grave; for Samuel's grave was at Ramah. The differencing of the realm of the dead from the grave, in which the body is laid, attests the continuance of the soul when separated from the body. Sheol, the Underworld, the Realm of the Dead, receives all the dead without distinction; there is no separation there between Righteous and Unrighteous (ver. 19); the divine law of requital does not reach the Beyond. Comp. Oehler: *Vet. test. de rebus post mortem fut.* 1846, and the same writer: *Die Lehre des Alt-Test. von der Unsterblichkeit* (Herz. xxi. 413 sq.): Böttcher: *de inferis rebusque post mortem futuris*, 1846. H. A. Hahn: *de spe immortalitatis sub V. T. gradatim exculta*, 1846. H. Schultz: *Alttestamentliche Theologie* I. 396 sq. [See also Oehler: *Theologie des Alt. Test.*, 1873, I., ꝸ 77 sq. (and Eng. Transl.). Delitzsch: *Bibl. Psychologie* (and Eng. Transl.). Himpel: *Unsterblichkeits lehre des Alten Test.*, 1857. Hodge's *Theology* III. 716 sq. Smith's *Bib. Dict.* Arts. "Dead, Hell, Pit." Fairbairn's *Bib. Dict.* "Hades." Ewald: *Lehre der Bibel von Gott*, 1873, III., ꝸ 345.—Tr.]

But while now the condition of departed souls is, as a rule, so conceived and represented, that there is no intercourse between them and the Upperworld, and no return from Sheol (Job vii. 9), this narrative of Samuel's appearance would be the only passage in the Old Testament that teaches the contrary [if it did teach it]. And in fact the narrative means to declare that Samuel really appeared (vers. 16, 20); as Vilmer remarks ("*Vom Aberglauben und Zauberei*," in the *Pastoral-theolog. Blättern*, 1862, p. 201), "unless violence is done to the text, it can be only understood as affirming that the real Samuel ascended from Sheol." That is the view of the Septuagint also in the addition

to 1 Chr. x. 13: "Saul inquired of the ventriloquist [witch], and Samuel the prophet answered him," and of the Son of Sirach xlvi. 20 (23): "and after he fell asleep he prophesied and showed the king his end, and out of the ground lifted up his voice in prophecy." In contradiction with this correct opinion is the view of the church-theologians of the 16th and 17th centuries, derived from the patristic writers,* namely, that by divine ordering Saul saw under the form of Samuel a ghost, an illusion produced by demonic, devilish powers. Tertullian (*de anima*, cap. 57) regards it as a "rivalry of truth by an unclean spirit;" "it was permitted," says he, "the pythonic spirit to *represent the soul of Samuel*, when Saul (after he had inquired of God) inquired of the dead. Far be it from us to believe that the soul of any saint, much less a prophet, can be drawn forth by a demon. We are taught that Satan transfigures himself into an angel of light, but not into a man of light." So Ephrem Syrus.† In agreement with this Luther says that it was "the devil's ghost," and Calvin that "it was not the real Samuel, but a spectre." So Grotius: "It is more credible that it was a deceptive spirit, and so the woman herself seems plainly to indicate when she says that gods were ascending out of the earth, thus terming those spirits, one of whom had *assumed Samuel's form*." Comp. S. Schmid (*Comm.*); A. Pfeiffer, *dubia vex. Cent.* II. *loc.* 77; Sal. Deyling, *observ. ss.* II. *obs.* 18; Buddæus, *hist. eccles.*, V. I. II. 243 sq.; J. Gerhard, *spectrum Endoreum*, Jen. 1663 [Bp. Patrick, *Comm. in loco*]. But the narrative gives not the slightest support to such a view. Neither the original narrator nor the redactor [editor] had in mind (judging from the narrative itself), an illusion produced by demonic or diabolical power. Theodoret, rejecting the view (suggested by the words of the narrative and frequent with the Talmudists) that Samuel's spirit was really evoked by the conjurations of the woman—held that, before the woman employed her arts, the appearance of Samuel was produced *by God's power*, and that God's voice itself was heard in those words against Saul. He says: "It is thence clear that the very God of all beings, having fashioned Samuel's form as He wished, uttered the judgment, the witch not having been able to do this, but God gave the decree even through enemies" [*Quæst. in Lib. Reg. ad* 1 Sam. xxviii.]. Appealing, for proof that God speaks through enemies, to the example of Balaam and to Ezek. xiv. 4, 7 sq. (where it is said of idolators "when they come to the prophet, I will answer them after *my* manner"), he explicitly affirms that the words ascribed to Samuel were a divine utterance spoken through the mouth of the woman who was acting against God's command. But against this view (which is held also by Justin, Origen, Ambrose, Augustine, and by some Rabbis, as R. Saadias) it is rightly remarked by D. Kimchi, that we can then see no reason why God should not have answered Saul before by Urim and Thummim, by dreams or by prophets. In fact it is fatal to this view that according to it God is here the answerer, while it is expressly said in ver. 6 that God answered Saul no more, and ver. 7 clearly means that *for this reason* Saul *turned from God to a sorceress*. An immediate divine miracle is assumed, which is to be brought into union with the anti-godly attempt of the sorceress and an open act of godlessness or God-forgetfulness on the part of Saul. Support would thus be given to the superstitious opinion that departed spirits may be summoned, while the fundamental view of the Old Testament every where is that a return of the dead to the land of the living is not possible, comp. 2 Sam. xii. 23; Job vii. 9. The necromantic superstition, on which Saul (who, unworthy of a divine answer, is guilty of disobeying the divine command. for which he had displayed so much zeal) and the woman (who practices this superstition as a trade) are united would, according to the narrative, have been the occasion or the medium of a miraculous divine act. Now it may be said indeed that God is accustomed in the wisdom of His providential government so to use man's evil purpose as to compel it to minister immediately to the revelation of His power and glory, as is shown in the history of Balaam and in the declaration of Ezek. xiv. 4, 7 sq. But in such cases express reference is made also to the divine control, comp. Gen. xv. 20; Ex. x. 27. But here there is not the slightest allusion to an immediate interference of God. On the contrary, we plainly read between the lines of this narrative that here a *sin* is committed; there is no trace of *divine action*. We cannot therefore accept this view, which is wholly without support, from a religious-ethical as well as from a theocratic-historical standpoint, however thorough and earnest a defence it may have found, as from Dachsel, *Bibl. hebr. accentuata*, Lips, 1729, p. 430 sq.; *Berl. Bib.*; O. v. Gerlach; Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychol.*, 2 ed., p. 428 sq.; Ströbel, *Luth. Zeitschr.*, 1867, p. 781 sq.: V. Rudoff, *Die Lehre vom Menschen*, 2 ed., 1863, II. 365; Hengstenberg, *Abhandl. zu den Psalm.* IV., p. 324 sq.; *Zeitschrift für Protest. u. Kirche*, 1851, p. 138 sq., *Abhandl.* "*Die Geschichte der Zauberin zu Endor*." Comp. Oehler in Herzog XXI. 414 sq.; Dächsel, *Bibelwerk;* Keil, *Komm.* The last named remarks: "This apparition was *externally* indeed *spiritual*, since Samuel was visible only to the woman, not to Saul, *but still* only an apparition of Samuel's soul in Hades *in the investiture of the earthly body and clothing of the prophet in order to become visible*." Keil himself remarks that this apparition of Samuel divinely summoned from Hades is a different thing from the appearances of Moses and Elijah at the Transfiguration of Christ (Matt. xvii.; Lu. ix.), because the latter appeared in heavenly refulgence and glory; this phenomenon, therefore, so often cited in support of this view falls away as unanalogous and irrelevant. Still less can we appeal to the angelic appearances in human form in Gen. xviii. and Judg. xiii., because these are superhuman beings. The contradictions in Keil's view are insoluble, namely, that Samuel appeared "in the *spiritual* form of the dwellers in Hades," and yet at the same time "in the investiture of *earthly* corporeality and clothing," that Samuel's appearance in spiritual Hades-form is set over against the announcement of these angels "in human form which was visible to the ordinary bodily eye," as if Samuel's apparition was not visible, though it is said that the sorceress saw it and was terrified.

* [But Justin Martyr (*Dial. cum Trypho*) holds that it was really Samuel.—Tr.]

† [And Cyril of Alexandria and Jerome.—Tr.]

According to this view this would be the only passage in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments in which a departed sinful man is called by divine power from the kingdom of the dead to the Upperworld. But this would stand in contradiction with Luke xvi. 17 sq., where Abraham refuses the rich man's request to send Lazarus to his father's house to preach to his living brethren. If it be urged that the prohibition of sorcery and necromancy (Deut. xviii. 1; Isa. viii. 19) does not exclude the possibility of God's permitting Samuel for special reasons to appear, we reply that neither from the connection of the related procedure nor from the words of the relator are there special grounds for supposing such a miracle, which would be sole of its kind. Apart from the fact that Saul had already vainly used all ordained means for learning God's will, and might thence conclude that his obstinate impenitence had rendered him unworthy of answer, the appearance and word of Samuel under present circumstances (if God had really been willing to permit it) could no longer have any religious-ethical or theocratic end; no *religious-ethical* end, because the means for rousing Saul to repentance were exhausted, for this recourse to a necromancer showed a mind thoroughly alienated from God and seeking help elsewhere, a disposition in respect to which even such a miraculous appearance of the prophet would be without effect, as in fact in Samuel's words there is no exhortation to repentance, and there is no trace afterwards of any change for the better in Saul;—no *theocratic* end, because Saul's rejection as king had already been repeatedly announced, and the sending of Samuel would have been superfluous for the announcement of Saul's impending fall, which, without a miracle, might have reached Saul's ear and made his heart tremble. We must therefore reject both the ancient church-view of an illusory appearance of Samuel produced by the woman's magic art, as the medium of a divine revelation, and also that of an appearance produced immediately by divine power without the woman's aid. Over against these views stands that which regards the whole procedure as a *mere deception*. Balthasar Becker, *te betoverde Wereld* [The Magic World] III. 6. Anton van Dale, *dissert. de divinationibus idololatricis sub V. T.* in the Treatise *de origine et prog. Idololatriæ*, p. 620 sq. Schmersahl, *Natürl. Erklärung der Gesch. Sauls mit d. Betrügerei zu Endor*, Hann., 1751. Köcher, *Versuch einer Erklärung der Gesch. Sauls und d. Betrügerin zu Endor*, Gera, 1780. Hensler, *Erläuter. des 1 B. Sam.*, p. 88 sq., *Exeget. Handbuch* IV. 251 sq. Comp. Böttcher, *de inferis*, I. 111 sq., Winer II. 627, Thenius, Diestel in Herz. XVII. 482 sq., Rütschi, *ibid. s. v. Endor*, A. Kuhle, *Bibl. Eschatologie*, 1870. 1 *Abth.*, p. 65 sq. and others [Clericus *in loco*]. Thenius' remark that "the deception is everywhere clear in the account" must be admitted except as to the "everywhere," though his reason drawn from ver. 21 [namely, that the woman had been in another room] is not tenable. The woman's conduct and words at Saul's arrival, and at the alleged appearance of Samuel, show that she made necromancy a trade and practiced the deceits usual with such people. The speech of Samuel, a long one under the circumstances, his appearance in the characteristic prophetic dress, and the fact that only *she* (not Saul) sees the apparition, leave no doubt that technical illusion and magical deception was here employed. But this does not prove that there was absolutely nothing but a refined, conscious deception, proceeding from special motives, as Thenius, for example, supposes that she was impelled by desire of revenge, having perhaps been ill-treated during the expelling of the sorcerers. Against such a merely conjectural pragmatic view, we must distinguish and combine an *objective* and a *subjective* element in the explanation of the event; the former a *religious-historical*, the latter a *psychological*. The former, which is presupposed in the whole account, consists in the fact that necromancy, according to the passage of the Law in which it is forbidden (Lev. xix. 31; xx. 5, 6, 26, 27; Deut. xviii. 9–14), was regarded not as a mere deception, but 1) as a heathen superstition, that is, as a wicked dealing with evil powers, which pertain to the domain of heathendom, out of which the Lord has chosen His people to be sanctified to Him; and 2) as an apostasy from the living God and a negation of the covenant-relation between Him and His people as a heathen abomination. That Saul and the woman undertake a wicked, ungodly, illegal thing, is the obvious judgment of the narrative; but there also appears here (as in the passage of the Law) the assumption, which was founded on universal belief, that in this magic art, as in the others borrowed from heathendom, there was not a mere deception with magic formulas, but a real contact and co-operation with mysterious ungodly powers, and with a secret, specifically heathenish mode of action—though the opinion of the older orthodox theologians as to the operation of wicked spirits or devils here is excluded by the narrative. Gradually came the perception that, as the idols of the heathen are "naught," so all heathen existence connected with idolatry is empty and vain. (Comp. Schultz, *Alttest. Theol.* I. 158 sq.) The second element in our explanation is the *psychological* in the woman's state of mind and soul. Proceeding on the supposition of a connection with mysterious powers, and perhaps under the excitation of narcotics, the *women* especially (as in heathen magic) who made necromancy a trade, might, through a fit psychical-somatical character, fall into an ecstatic, visionary state (as modern science supposes in somnambulic and magnetic phenomena), in which with superstitious self-deception they had inward perception of the things or persons inquired for (the inquirers of course seeing nothing), and uttered their recollections or anticipations in dull, suppressed tones, so that it seemed as if the utterance came from other voices, particularly as if the professedly summoned person spoke. See Tholuck: *Die Proph. und ihre Weissagung*, § 1, "*Die Mantik und die dort angeführten Thatsachen nebst literarischen Nachweisungen.*" The *seeing* and *speaking* of the woman of Endor must be thought of in accordance with the nature and characteristic phenomena of ancient and modern mantic (magic), and like the visional-somnambulic states, of which there are so many examples in our time, especially among women. What the woman in this condition (in which she identified herself with Samuel) said of Saul in the name of Samuel was partly nothing but what Samuel had repeatedly

said, partly nothing beyond the reach of natural conjecture and inference; for after the universally known divine rejection of Saul, after the sad line of experiences which showed that God had forsaken him (he having forsaken God), and especially after the fact, which the woman learned from Saul herself [v. 15], that in the presence of the Philistine army he had inquired of the Lord in vain, the fatal issue of this war could not be doubtful. Calvin has touched the correct view of the woman's condition when he says that "her *senses were deceived*, so that she wrongly supposed that she saw Samuel," though he errs in ascribing this effect to devilish powers. Along with the deceit which was necessarily connected with this necromantic trade, we must suppose a psychological fact (attested by the history of mantic [magic] and by modern science), which raises that part of the procedure that relates to Samuel's apparition and words out of the sphere of conscious deception and illusive magic. It is only in this way that we can explain the fact that the narrator, according to whom the essential point is that only the woman, not Saul, sees the apparition of Samuel, represents it as if Samuel really appeared and spoke.

The significance of this event for Saul is to be seen not merely from the *announcement* of his fall in battle, as the completion of the divine judgment, but also from the attitude towards the living God into which he has brought himself by his impenitence and self-hardening. Winer (*s. v.* Saul) takes a simple and correct view of the case when he says: "It is a shame that the king, who had expelled all sorcerers, *etc.* (vers. 3, 9), must himself at last fall into the hands of a sorceress." Saul's rejection as king was not his definite banishment from the presence of God. Even if the theocratic kingship to which he had been called had become impossible for him and his house in consequence of his disobedience against God, the king of his people, yet he individually might be saved. But he persisted in his self-blinding, and the sentence was complete in his personal rejection. A tool of heathenish superstition, which he as king ought to have punished, must serve as a means of announcing to him his sentence of death as the conclusion of the divine judicial process, the Lord having preserved silence, and thus already passed sentence on him. The heathen Philistine nation, the hereditary enemy of God's people, constant war against whom was to be a holy state-affair for the theocratic king, becomes the executor of the divine decree, and carries out against him and his house the sentence of death announced by the necromantic impostor. Calvin: "Saul called not on God with humility, prostrate mind and penitent, believing heart, and therefore God rightly rejected him, and the divine threatening was verified in him (Ye shall call on me, but shall not be heard). He himself shows plainly that he approached God as one in despair, because he had no root of true faith in his heart." In his life-course up to this time Saul had descended step by step deeper into the abyss of unbelief; he stands now on the last step, about to plunge irretrievably into the depths of endless destruction.

2. There is a silence of God that is the dumb reply to perverse invocation of His name, wherein man seeks to make the divine will subservient to his own, instead of humbly bowing under the will of God. Such a persistent silence on God's part is the result of persistent opposition of the heart to Him, and of the thence resulting hardening. When man makes his own sinful will his god that he worships and his lord that he serves, he shows the religious perversity of his soul when, like Saul, he nevertheless calls on God and inquires His will, in order to make this will subservient to his selfish desire. Thus from unbelief follows necessarily *superstition* [Germ.: *aus unglauben folgt aberglaube.*—Tr.]

[Of the three schemes of explanation of this difficult passage now held—namely, that which regards the affair as a mere deception (Chandler, Thenius), that which supposes a sort of mesmeric clairvoyance in the woman (Keil, Erdmann), and that which sees here a real appearance of Samuel by divine power, the last has found most favor among English orthodox expositors. In many cases the exegesis is determined by dogmatic considerations, as that such a real appearance of a dead person is impossible, or not in keeping with Scripture, or that the summoning of Samuel by a witch is contrary to the holiness of God. Such considerations must, however, be put aside when our object is to discover simply what the narrator affirms. It is clear that the writer says that Samuel appeared and spoke (so Ewald, Erdmann). How are we to accept this? The writer, says one class of critics, shared the superstitions of his day, and believed that the conjurations of the witch really had power over the dead. Erdmann, however, is not satisfied with this explanation, and accounts for the narrator's affirmation that Samuel really appeared on the ground that besides the element of trickery in the woman's procedure, there was a *real* psychological identifying of herself with the deceased prophet, so that the narrator might represent her personation of him as his personal appearance. But certainly this explanation is hardly satisfactory, and it is not easy to see how we can avoid finding in the narration a distinct declaration that Samuel actually appeared and spoke. The only thing in the account itself that opposes this view is the fact that the woman only and not Saul saw the apparition. But it is quite possible that the apparition may have been in a different room from that in which Saul found himself—though this is not mentioned. Such seems to be the plain statement of the text. The dogmatic and other difficulties are discussed by Erdmann. Chandler, in his *Life of David*, gives a full and forcible presentation of the grounds for supposing the whole affair to be an imposture by the woman.—Tr.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Starke: Ver. 1. Pious men are walls and pillars of cities and lands, Ezek. xxii. 30; therefore if such men have to start away, all misfortune starts forth too. (Gen. vii. 7 sq.). Ver. 2. Virtue and bravery deserve to be rewarded; but the world is wont to promise believers reward, in order to draw them off from the right way (Matth. iv. 9).—[Ver. 3: Scott: Hypocrites are frequently very zealous against those crimes to which they are not tempted at the time, or from which they may suffer detriment; and apostates fre-

quently commit those sins, which they once were most earnest in opposing.—TR.].—Vers. 4, 5. J. LANGE: So it goes with the ungodly, that here already they feel in themselves a hell, when their evil conscience awakes in them.—SCHLIER: Saul fears before men, because he no longer feared God; if we see things rightly, all fear has no other ground than lack of the fear of God.—The fear of man has its ground in unbelief; true fear of God makes one strong and courageous.—Ver. 6. STARKE: To go to God when in distress is good and necessary; but it must be done without hypocrisy, with true repentance and from the heart (Isa. xxvi. 16).—If we do not hear God's voice when it goes well with us, God can and will refuse to hear our voice also, when it goes ill with us (Prov. i. 24 sq.). S. SCHMID: Ungodly men and hypocrites care little for God and His service in good days: but when misfortune comes, then they wish to become pious also, and seek God's counsel and help in every way.—SCHLIER: The Lord gave Saul no answer. To turn to the Lord Saul has not wished; had he wished that, he would also have found the Lord's grace. But Saul had no concern about that; he wished to use the Lord for his own ends, he needed a disclosure about his situation, and such a disclosure he wished to force for himself without returning to the Lord.—CALVIN: By this example we should learn to draw near to God with all humility when we wish to ask His counsel in prayer, far from all obstinate self-will and passion; for His arm is not shortened that He cannot help those who take refuge in Him. Whence comes it that so often our prayers are in vain, and our hopes deceive us? Our sins shut off the grace of God from us, and our unrighteousness separates us from our God, and fixes an immeasurable gulf between us and God.—Ver. 7. S. SCHMID: Happy is he who so receives God's punitive silence or other signs of His wrath, as to be led thereby to true repentance; but hardened hearts take refuge, when God is silent, in wicked men and Satan.—SCHLIER: An example of the fact that the unbelief which has lost the living God is always full of superstition instead, and thereby is turned over not merely to empty delusion and vain deception, but also to the powers of darkness.—The human heart needs something to cling to, something to which it may hold fast, a prop which its tendrils may firmly clasp; therefore when it leaves Him for whom it was made, when it sinks into unbelief, then it clings to the power of superstition and of darkness. Nothing frees from superstition but true faith.—[Ver. 7. TAYLOR: Here is the great difference between Saul in his sins, and David in his backslidings. From each of his falls you hear David come sobbing out a sorrowful confession and appeal like that in the fifty-first Psalm; in each of Saul's wickednesses you see him assuming the attitude of sterner defiance toward the Almighty; or if there be any sorrow in his heart at all, it is for the loss he has himself sustained, or the suffering he has himself endured, and not for the dishonor which he has done to God.—TR.].—Ver. 8. HEDINGER: So great is the power of conscience that even those who desire evil are ashamed to have it known.—CRAMER: The ungodly love darkness and shrink from the light (John iii. 19), but God knows their works (Prov. xvii. 16).—Vers. 11, 12. HEDINGER [from HALL]: It is no rare thing to lose even our wit and judgment together with graces; how justly are they given to sottishness, that have given themselves over to sin!—Ver. 15. SCHLIER: We see here quite clearly that the souls of the righteous rest in God's hand, and no torment touches them. He who dies in faith enters into rest in the Lord his God; and since, though the whole world come and use all its arts of sorcery, it brings no such soul back to the earth any more, it follows that we men have no power over departed spirits.—[SCOTT: Many who despise the servants of God while they live, are so far convinced of their wisdom and fidelity, that they vainly wish for their counsel and instruction, in distressing circumstances, after their death. But in that blessed world to which they are removed, they have done with fear, favor and affection, and are become far more determined than ever in the service and cause of God; and were they to appear they would denounce the doom of impenitent sinners with more awful decision than before.—Ver. 15. TAYLOR: "I am sore distressed." Oh! the wild wail of this dark misery! There is a deep pathos and a weird awesomeness in this despairing cry; but there is no confession of sin, no beseeching for mercy; nothing but the great, over-mastering ambition to preserve himself.—TR.].—Ver. 16. S. SCHMID: He is highly unfortunate and foolish who, when God forsakes him, prefers to seek help and counsel from creatures, rather than by true repentance to make himself again a reconciled friend to God.—SCHLIER: Wilt thou have light for all the riddles and dark questions of this life, betake thyself to God's Word; there enough is revealed, there is what is necessary to find everything, and what goes beyond that, comes of evil.—Ver. 18. SCHLIER: God's wrath is so dreadful, that when all has been in vain He utterly gives up the sinner to His judgments, and unsparingly causes him to learn that sin is ruin to a people.—The judgment of hardening comes only when the crime of hardening has first entered. When we shut ourselves against the voice of God, then on the part of God also must hardening follow, as surely as God is a holy and righteous God, who does not allow Himself to be trifled with.—Ver. 20. CRAMER: The ungodly do not grow better after God's wrath is made known, but always worse (Acts vii. 54). [TAYLOR: Alas for Saul! how changed is he now from that day when Samuel communed with him concerning the kingdom, or when, in the first noble assertion of his royal right, he delivered the men of Jabesh-Gilead from their threatened destruction! Did ever promise of so fair a life ripen into such bitter fruit?—TR.]

[Vers. 1, 2. One of two things David must now do, and either will be grossly wrong, disgraceful, and hurtful both to himself and to others. To this miserable alternative he had brought himself, by distrusting God and relying on deception. It is one of the severest earthly penalties of wrong-doing, that it often leads to the apparent necessity of doing other and greater wrong.

[Vers. 4–20. *Contrast between Saul and David at this crisis of their history:* 1) Both are in great distress. We see David in the camp of the Philistines, seemingly compelled to fight against Israel and against the anointed of Jehovah (comp.

xxvi. 11); and presently we see Saul journeying in fasting and fatigue, in peril and gloomy desperation across the mountain, and entering in disguise the witch's abode. Both are entirely unable to decide what to do or what to hope for. 2) Each is suffering the consequences of past sin. 3) But one has utterly forsaken God, and feels that "God is departed" from him, and now the sad story of his disobedience comes back (vers. 17, 18), and his worst fears are confirmed (ver. 19), till at last, behold his mighty frame prone on the earth in an agony of despair. The other has yielded to distrust and fallen into sin, but has not at heart abandoned the Lord; it may have been in no such lively exercise then as to give him any comfort, but sinning, sorrowing David had still in his heart the fear of Jehovah. 4) And as a result, the fallen king, ruinously defeated and despairing, dies next day by his own hand (xxxi.); while the merciful over-ruling of God's Providence extricates David from his position (xxix.), and prepares for him a new chastening, which brings him to repentance and trust (xxx. 4, 6–8). Behold the difference between a sinning man impenitent, unbelieving, proud, and a sinning man ready to repent, clinging to faith and really humble before God. (Comp. below on chap. xxx., "Hist. and Theol.").—Tr.]

[Vers. 21–25. Even in a sorceress, with all her deceptions and delusions, her wild and dreadful life, the true woman comes out at the mute appeal of misery. How kindly persuasive her words; how prompt her hospitable labors. We take leave of her, as she took leave of the ruined king, with a pitying heart.—Tr.]

II. *David's Dismissal from the Philistine Army.*

Chapter XXIX. 1–11.

1 Now [And] the Philistines gathered together all their armies[1] to Aphek; and
2 the Israelites pitched by a [the] fountain[2] which is in Jezreel. And the lords[3] of
the Philistines passed on by hundreds and by thousands, but [and] David and his
3 men passed on in the rearward [rear] with Achish. Then said the princes[4] of the
Philistines, What *do* these Hebrews *here?* And Achish said unto the princes of
the Philistines, Is not this David, the servant of Saul the [*om.* the] king of Israel,
which [who] hath been with me these days or these years,[5] and I have found no
4 fault in him since he fell *unto me* unto this day? And the princes of the Philis-
tines were wroth with him; and the princes of the Philistines said unto him, Make
this fellow [the man] return, that he may go again to his place which thou hast ap-
pointed him, and let him not go down with us to battle, lest in the battle he be an
adversary[6] to us; for wherewith should he reconcile himself [make himself accept-

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. Lit. "camps."—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 1. Sept. Endor, Arab. "near the city (עִיר) Jezreel," Syr. apparently "in In" as proper name. Eng. A. V. is correct.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 2. סֶרֶן *seren* (rendered "lord" in Eng. A. V. throughout this chapter), a word of doubtful origin, supposed by some to be connected with the similar Aramaic subst. which means "axle," magistrates being considered supports on which the state revolves. On the relations between the Aramaic and the Phœnician-Canaanitish dialects see Schröder, *Phönizische Sprache, Einl.* § 11.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 3. The ordinary word שָׂר, which Eng. A. V. renders "princes" throughout this chapter.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 3. An indefinite phrase, but not therefore suspicious. The versions have dealt variously with it. Chald. and Vulg. follow the Heb. literally (as Eng. A. V.), except that Vulg. has "*multis diebus.*" Syr. has "this time and time and months," which is understood by some to mean "these two years and some months," but it is more probably a reproduction of the phrase in xxvii. 7, and = "a year and some months" (so Arab.). The Sept. ἡμέρας τοῦτο δεύτερον ἔτος perhaps contains a duplet, as Wellh. suggests, and the text of Stier and Theile (eclectic) gives δεύτερον ἔτος σήμερον "two years to-day." Sept. probably read שְׁנָתַיִם "two years," not, however, זֶה יָמִים שְׁנַיִם (suggested by Wellh. as basis of the Heb. and Greek texts) which would not be rendered "two years" but "two days." It seems better, on the whole, to retain the present Heb. text, and regard Sept. and Syr. as free renderings.—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 4. Heb. שָׂטָן *satan*, used in the general sense of "adversary" in the earlier books of the Bible, and with the Art. as a proper name in Job and Zechariah, and without the Art. in 1 Chr. xxi. 1. The verb. שָׂטַן "to hate, be hostile to," is used only in the general sense. Fürst refers to the curious view of Justin Martyr (*Dial. cum Tryph.* 103) that Σατανᾶς = נחשׁ סטא "the apostate serpent."—Tr.]

5 able] unto his master? *should it* not *be* with the heads of these men? Is not this
David, of whom they sang one to another in dances, saying, Saul slew his thou-
sands, and David his ten thousands?
6 Then Achish called David, and said unto him, Surely [*om.* surely], as the Lord
[As Jehovah] liveth, thou hast been [art] upright, and thy going out and thy coming
in with me in the host is good in my sight; for I have not found evil in thee since
the day of thy coming unto me unto this day; nevertheless the lords favour thee
7 not [but in the eyes of the lords thou art not good]. Wherefore [And] now re-
8 turn, and go in peace, that thou displease not the lords of the Philistines. And
David said unto Achish, But[7] what have I done? and what hast thou found in thy
servant so long as I have been with thee [from the day[8] when I was in thy presence]
unto this day, that I may not go fight against the enemies of my lord the king?
9 And Achish answered and said unto David, I know[9] that thou art good in my sight
as an angel[10] of God; notwithstanding [but] the princes of the Philistines have said,
10 He shall not go up with us to the battle. Wherefore [And] now, rise up early in
the morning with thy master's servants that are come with thee;[11] and as soon as
11 ye be up early in the morning, and have light, depart. So David and his men
rose up early to depart in the morning, to return into the land of the Philistines.
And the Philistines went up to[12] Jezreel.

[7] [Ver. 8. כִּי is here a cohortative and illative particle, and might be rendered "then" (so Erdmann), but, as it is also adversative, the translation of Eng. A. V. is better.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 8. מִיּוֹם. Wellhausen: Either omit אֲשֶׁר or write the Art. before יוֹם.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 9. Perhaps better with Thenius and Philippson: "I know it, for (or, yea) thou art, *etc.*" This avoids the redundancy of the translation of Eng. A. V. and Erdmann: "I know . . . in my eyes." The *quia* of the Vulgate = "quod."—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 9. Erdmann: "Messenger," not so well. Sept. omits, perhaps because the phrase was considered unsuitable in the mouth of a heathen. For the significance of its use see the Exposition and Translator's note.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 10. Here the Sept. inserts: "and go ye to the place where I have appointed you, and set thou nothing evil in thy heart, for thou art good in my sight." Thenius and Wellhausen favor this insertion on the ground that after the "rise early" follows usually the mention of the thing done, while the Heb. text has the unnecessary repetition "rise early . . . and rise early" (the "as soon as" of Eng. A. V. is not expressed in the Heb.). On the other hand, we cannot well account for the omission of this clause, if it formed a part of the original text, while the insertion might have been made by a copyist (or the phrase added on the margin) to soften the repetition. We may suppose the verb here repeated because of the intervening clause, which called for a change in the Number of the Verb.—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 11. Some MSS. contain the preposition, which is here obviously involved in the construction. Sept., Vat.: "went up to fight against Jezreel," but Alex. has "against Israel," which is adopted by Thenius, on which Wellh. says: "Thenius is misled by Eusebius into putting Aphek in the vicinity of Endor (Lagarde, *Onomast.* 216, 28); in that case, of course, the expression 'the Philistines went up to Jezreel' would be meaningless, since they were already there. But Aphek is the same in xxix. 1 as in iv. 1, near Mizpeh and Ebenezer." Yet, from Aphek near Mizpeh to Jezreel would be going *down*, not *up*. From some lower place (as near Shunem) they would naturally advance to seize the *hill* Jezreel, which lay between their camp and Saul's. The fountain in Jezreel (ver. 1) is perhaps the grand spring at the foot of Gilboa, regarded as being in the *district* of Jezreel.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. Resumption of the *narrative of the war between the Philistines and Israelites*, xxviii. 1–4, with an exacter description of the positions of the two armies. *Aphek*—to be distinguished from the places of the same name in Asher (Josh. xix. 30; Judges i. 31), in Judah on the mountain (Joshua xv. 53), and near Ebenezer (1 Samuel iv. 1)—belonged to Issachar, and is probably the same with the present el Afuleh near Solam=Sunem (v. d. Velde, *Mem.*, p. 286; Ew., *Gesch.*, III., 142, A. 2). Southeast of this Philistine rendezvous the Israelites were encamped "at the spring near Jezreel," the present Zerin (Rob., III., i. 395) [Am. ed., ii. 319–323, where Robinson explains the identity of the names Jezreel and Zerin, the Heb. *el* often becoming *in* in Arabic, as Beitin = Bethel; so Zerel=Zerin.—Tr.] *Ain* [= "spring"] is not = Endor, as the Sept. wrongly gives it, whence it is adopted by Euseb. in the Onomasticon, but the present *Ain Jalud*,* a very bold spring on the northwest declivity of Gilboa, whence flows a brook through the Wady Jalud into the Jordan. There the Israelitish army encamped opposite the Phlistine in a well-watered spot near *Jezreel.* "Elsewhere also a *spring* gives name to a stopping-place or border line, 2 Sam. xvii. 17; Num. xxxiv. 11" (Böttch.).—Ver. 2. Vivid description of the array of the Philistine army, not at the mustering (Bunsen), but in their movement to Aphek. In divisions of hundreds and thousands, at the head of their divisions the "Princes [lords] of the Philistines" marched on, properly "marched over," that is, over the plain of Esdraelon to Jezreel (comp. ver. 4). Here in the north they advanced with their whole force, in order to bring about a decisive battle in the plain with the Israelites, not being able to maintain themselves permanently in the mountains. Their advance to Jezreel forced Saul to lead his whole army thither. There is no ground or necessity for supposing that they had occupied or ravaged the middle portion of the country where Saul's royal residence, Gibeah lay, in order then to carry the war into the extremely fruitful northern district, and thus soon conquer all Israel (Ew., *Gesch.*, III., 142), "for towards the end of his

* [That is, "spring of Goliath," according to a tradition that here David killed Goliath; or "spring of Gilead" as the ancient name of Gilboa (A. P. Stanley in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, Art. Jezreel).—Tr.]

reign Saul's military strength was probably not so great that he could have divided it" (Then). The Philistines having begun their march, Achish found himself with David in the rearguard.—Ver. 3. The other leaders object to the presence of David and his men: **What do these Hebrews here?** As it is said in ver. 11 that David returned to the land of the Philistines, and according to xxx. 1 they reached Ziklag after a three days' march, the objection of the Philistine princes must have been made on Israelitish soil, or near the Palestinian border, but not at the commencement of the march. From Achish's reply it appears that the princes distrusted David, suspecting that he would go over to his own people and fight against the Philistines. Achish observes 1) that David is servant of Saul, king of Israel, thus alluding to his enmity with Saul, 2) that he has already been allied with him a long time against Saul, "these days or these years" = "a year and a day," indefinite statement of the time mentioned in xxvii. 7: "a year and four months,"—and 3) that in all this time he has seen nothing in him to awaken suspicions of treachery. **From the day of his falling** (נָפְלוֹ, instead of [rather, used alongside of—Tr.] נְפֹלוֹ, see Ew., § 255, d). The vss. add "to me," according to the usual construction of the verb, though we need not therefore insert "to me" (אֵלַי) in the text (Then.), "since it is understood from the context" (Keil). On these grounds Achish thought himself quite sure of David, comp. xxvii. 12.—Ver. 4. The twofold designation of the Philistine leaders, here "chiefs" [Eng. A. V. "princes"], in ver. 2, "princes" [Eng. A. V. "lords"] comes from the circumstantial character of the narration, not from oversight (Then.), though the Sept. and Vulg. omit the second name. **The chiefs of the Philistines** did not accept Achish's explanation, but **were angry with him**, and demanded of him that he send David back **to his place, which he** (Achish) **had appointed him**, that is, to *Ziklag*. They said: **He shall not go down with us into the battle.** "*Go down*" (יֵרֵד) is a regular technical military expression, derived from the necessity in that mountainous country of descending into the *plain* to fight,* comp. xxvi. 10; xxx. 24. To Achish's defence of David they reply: 1) he might become an *adversary* to them in battle, though he had hitherto been an ally; 2) he might wish to recommend himself to his lord, though he had up to this time opposed him,—**with the heads of these men.** The Hithpael of the verb (רצה) indicates zealous self-activity, "earnestly to commend one's self," or, "to seek to make one's self acceptable" (Ew., § 124 a). "*These*," they say, pointing to the Philistine troops. By defeating a part of our force, said they, he would try to regain Saul's favor. Herein is a recognition of David's bravery and military ability, which they would be the less disposed to doubt when they recollected the defeat he had formerly inflicted on Goliath and the Palestine army. For they say 3) **Is this not David, of whom they sang in dances?** &c. Comp. xviii. 7 with xvi. 11. It is the same argument that Achish's servants used against him on his first visit to Achish's court. The Philistines' recollection of that achievement is here to be the means of rescuing David from the painful necessity of going into battle with the Philistines against his own people.

Ver. 6. Achish is obliged to yield to the decided demand of his comrades. He assures David that his confidence in him is unshaken, that he regards him as an honorable and faithful man. Achish's oath "by the life of *Jehovah*" is to be explained not by the fact that a Hebrew is here the narrator (Then.), or that Achish had learned from David to know and honor the God of Israel (S. Schmid), but by his desire to attest more strongly the truth of his words by invoking the God whom David worshipped. Achish, however, does not say that he had been pleased with David in former wars (Tremell., Vatablus), but his words refer to *this* campaign, he assuring him of his confidence in contrast with the distrust of the princes. He means to say: To *me* thou art the object of undoubting trust, but the *princes* do not wish thee to take part in the campaign. Thus he excuses himself, as it were, to David for the fact that he must now (ver. 7) bid him return, **that he may do nothing evil in the eyes of the princes of the Philistines.**—Ver. 8. As *Achish* remains true in word and deed to his *honorable confidence in* David, so *David* remains true to his rôle (xxvii.) of *dishonorable prevarication* to Achish; for, when he says: **that I should not go and fight against the enemies of my lord, the king**—this "my lord, the king," may refer as well to Achish as to Saul; and, for the rest, he could not have been in earnest in saying that he would fight, for he certainly would not have fought against his own countrymen (Then.).—Ver. 9. Achish trustingly accepts David's words as referring to himself, and renews the assurance of confidence in his honor. The **I know** is the reply to David's assertion of his faithfulness in the question: "What have I done?" *etc.* [Translate: "I know it, for thou art good," *etc.*—Tr.] Achish's testimony to David's fidelity and honor (on the words: "yea, thou art in my eyes," *etc.* comp. Gen. xlviii. 19) rises to the point of comparing him with an "angel (= messenger)* of God," see 2 Sam. xiv. 17; xix. 27. I esteem thee as highly, he would say, as if thou wert sent to me from God—but the princes say: "he shall not go up with us to the war." The word "go up" refers to the progress of the march from the south upwards towards the north.—Ver. 10. **With the servants of thy lord**, that is, of Saul; whose subjects they were. [On the text see "Textual and Grammatical."—Tr.]—Ver. 11. David returns to Philistia, to Ziklag (xxx. 1).—That David, in order to avoid a sad alternative, *himself* artfully roused the opposition of the Philistine princes to his participation in the campaign (as Thenius thinks not impossible), is, even

* [This is a sufficient reply to Wellhausen's remark that "the narrator here forgets that he is dealing with a Philistine, who [as dwelling in a plain] would probably use the opposite expression [go up]."—Tr.]

* [This word is probably to be taken here in a supernatural sense. We need not suppose this a Hebrew idea put into the mouth of the Philistine; the conception of superhuman messengers of God (= our "angels") is so general and natural that there is no difficulty in supposing it to be known and used among the Philistines.—Tr.]

if possible, too bold a conjecture; the narrative gives no ground for it.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. God's patience is such that the sins of the members of His kingdom are not visited with expulsion from communion with Him, so long as they, like David, direct their inner life to Him in faith, and are willing to be guided by Him. But such sins as we here see in David—fear of man, unfaith, having recourse to heathen protection, deceitful behaviour towards the kind and honorable king Achish—God does not pass by, on the one hand, without the exhibition of His punitive *righteousness*, *partly* punishing sin with sin, as we here see in David from a fundamental sin (doubt and little faith) all other sins issuing, these again coming one from another, *partly* inflicting internal anguish and external perplexities and painful experiences; but, on the other hand, he restrains evil consequences, and brings into play former exhibitions of His helping *might* (as here in the Philistines' recollection of David's victory over Goliath and the army), so to order all things according to His *mercy and wisdom* that the blameworthy *evil* does not lead to *destruction*, and subserves the ends of His *providential government of the world*.

2. Certainly David's untruthfulness is not to be *measured* by *Christian morality* (Then.), for the mingling of the standpoints of the Old and New Testaments by introducing the latter into the former, both as respects moral knowledge and biblical ethics, and as respects religious truth and biblical dogmatics, is set aside by the difference of the two Testaments in the development of the history of revelation and the kingdom of God. Especially in judging of individual, concrete, ethical phenomena in the relation between man and man, where the principle of love is limited by national relations, we must take into consideration the limitation of the theocratic principle of life to the sphere of the national life in respect to those peoples that were outside of the theocracy. Nevertheless all ethical phenomena in the life of the Old-Testamental bearers of the divine revelation and the theocratic principle must be looked at from the highest point of view, which is given in God's holy will itself, and judged as to their ethical character and value by the absolute standard. The God of absolute truth (Num. xxiii. 19; 2 Sam. xv. 29) demands truth from his "saints" (comp. Ex. xx. 6 with xix. 6 and Prov. vi. 16-19; Deut. xix. 11). To the God of truth and faithfulness (Ps. xl. 10–12 [9–11]) the lips must not speak falsehood (Ps. xxxiv. 15 [13]), as David himself declares. Apart, however, from the stand-point of revelation, David's conduct to Achish is condemned from the stand-point of natural-human morality by the unsuspecting faithfulness and honor of the heathen king.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 1, 2. S. SCHMID: The sins of the princes of the people put weapons into the hands of the enemies of God and the Church.—Ver. 3 sq. [SCOTT: While presumptuous sinners are given up to the effects of their own counsels and driven headlong to destruction, the sins of the upright are repented of and pardoned; and the Lord takes care both of their peace and reputation.—TR.]—HEDINGER (from HALL): O the wisdom and goodness of our God, that can raise up an adversary to deliver us out of those evils which our friends cannot!—SCHLIER: When the Lord thinks on us, He comes at the right time with His blessing also. He has ways, even where we know no further expedient, and can give counsel and help where we might already despair.—Ver. 4. SCHLIER: God's children are not people that have no failings and weaknesses any more. But on account of such failings God does not yet cast off His children. Even if we sin, He does not yet at once give us up; He chastens us, but He does not cast us off.—[Ver. 6. SCOTT: When worldly people have no evil thing to say of us, but will bear testimony to our uprightness, we need desire no more from them: and this we should aim to acquire by prudence, meekness and a blameless life. But their *flattering* commendations are almost always purchased by improper compliances, or some measure of deception, and commonly may cover us with confusion. —TR.]—Ver. 7. CRAMER: God guides His saints wonderfully (Ps. iv. 4 [3]), and holds them back from sins which if they were given up to themselves, they would commit, acting against their own conscience, and rescues them from great peril also, into which they would otherwise have fallen through their thoughtless projects.—HEDINGER [from HALL]: One degree of dissimulation draws on another; those which have once given way to a faulty course cannot easily either stop or turn back.—[HENRY: No one knows how strong the temptation is to compliment and dissemble, which they are in that attend great men, and how hard it is to avoid it. —TR.]—*What wholesome effects are produced under God's guidance by that intercourse which in the world is indispensably necessary between those who have part in God's kingdom and those who stand aloof from it?* 1) For those who stand aloof from the kingdom of God: *a*) that they involuntarily give honor to the living God; *b*) that they recognize in those who belong to His kingdom the power of a higher divine character, and are compelled to bow before that power (ver. 9); *c*) that in themselves the remains of the divine image again come forward, and they find pleasure in that which is ethically good and beautiful. 2) For those who have part in God's kingdom themselves: *a*) the *consoling perception* that even they who stand aloof from God's kingdom have to serve as instruments for the fulfilment of the divine purposes and designs of salvation (Prov. xvi. 7); *b*) the *wonderful confirmation* of the truth that all things must work together for good to them that love God (Rom. viii. 27), and *c*) *humbling self-knowledge* in respect to their own sins and faults, in view of the morally noble behaviour of those who stand aloof from the kingdom of God, while they themselves are wanting therein.

III. *David's Victory over the Amalekites who destroyed Ziklag.*

CHAPTER XXX. 1-31.

1 AND it came to pass, when David and his men were come[1] to Ziklag on the third
day, that the Amalekites had invaded the south[2] and Ziklag, and smitten Ziklag
2 and burned it with fire; And had taken the women captives [captive the women]
that were therein [*ins.* both small and great];[3] they slew[4] not any either great or
small [*om.* either great or small], but carried them away [off] and went on their
3 way.[5] So [And] David and his men came to the city, and behold, it was burned
with fire, and their wives and their sons and their daughters were taken captives.
4 Then [And] David and the people that were with him lifted up their voice and
5 wept, until they had no more power to weep. And David's two wives were taken
captives, Ahinoam the Jezreelitess, and Abigail the wife of Nabal the Carmelite.[6]
6 And David was greatly distressed [was in a great strait],[7] for the people spake of
stoning him, because the soul of all the people was grieved [bitter], every man for
his sons and his daughters; but David encouraged [strengthened] himself in the
Lord [Jehovah] his God.
7 And David said to Abiathar the priest, Ahimelech's son, I pray thee, bring me
hither [*om.* hither] the ephod.[8] And Abiathar brought thither [*om.* thither] the
8 ephod to David. And David inquired at the Lord [of Jehovah], saying, Shall I
pursue[9] after this troop? shall I overtake them? And he answered him, Pursue!
for thou shalt surely overtake *them* and without fail recover *all* [for thou shalt
9 overtake and deliver]. So [And] David went, he and the six hundred men that
were with him, and came to the brook Besor, where those that were left behind
10 stayed.[10] But [And] David pursued, he and four hundred men; for [and] two
hundred abode behind, which were so faint that they could not go over the brook
Besor.[11]
11 And they found an Egyptian in the field, and brought[12] him to David, and gave

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

1 [Ver. 1. Some MSS. have כבא, and in the better codices the Inf. is written fully בוא.—TR.]

2 [Ver. 1. Vulg. and Arab. read: "the south of Ziklag," but *negeb* is probably here a proper name, the "South-country;" this may account for the absence of the Art.—TR.]

3 [Ver. 2. The order of words in Eng. A. V. here is opposed to the accents and to the syntax. The reading of the Heb. text, however, is harsh; we do not expect the descriptive phrase: "both small and great" to be applied to "women," and therefore the reading of the Sept.: "the women and all that was in it" (comp. ver. 19) commends itself as better. Dr. Erdmann, however, rejects it.—TR.]

4 [Ver. 2. "And slew no one," as in Chald., Vulg. and some MSS., is much easier. Syr. and Arab. strangely omit the negative, and read: "they slew the men."—TR.]

5 [Ver. 2. Erdmann writes the passage from "and the Amalekites" in ver. 1 to the end of ver. 2 as a parenthesis, which is allowable, but not necessary.—TR.]

6 [Ver. 5. Some MSS. of Kennicott and De Rossi have "the Carmelitess," referring to Abigail. See note on xxvii. 3.—TR.]

7 [Ver. 6. That is, "was in difficulty and danger," an idea not now so well expressed by the word "distress." For "grieved" or "bitter" the Bib. Com. suggests "exasperated," which conveys the sense with precision. —TR.]

8 [Ver. 7. This word is commonly and properly transferred, not translated (so Sept., Vulg., Syr., Chald.); Sym., however, renders it by ἐπωμίς, Aq. by ἐπένδυμα, and Arab. by a descriptive phrase: "the breast-plate by which thou inquirest."—TR.]

9 [Ver. 8. As this is a principal, not a subordinate question, Wellh. would insert the Interrog. הֲ before this verb.—TR.]

10 [Ver. 9. It seems impossible to do anything with this phrase. That something stood here in an early form of the text is shown by the Sept. and other VSS.; but these words give no sense: they cannot be proleptical, as Erdmann explains them, for the word נוֹתָרִים supposes a division already made. The Syr. abandons the text, and explains: "and David left two hundred men." The Vulg. reading: "and certain tired ones stayed" (preferred by Then., and rejected by Erdmann), is easy; but the statement is here unnecessary and out of place. It is more satisfactory to suppose that the phrase was early introduced into the text by clerical repetition from the following verse.—TR.]

11 [Ver. 10. Wellh. suggests that the two halves of this verse have changed places; but this is unnecessary, for, though the second half would fit on to ver. 9, the present order is quite in accordance with Heb. form of narration, in which the explanation is often made to follow the principal statement.—TR.]

12 [Ver. 11. Some MSS., and Sept. and Ar. read: "took him and brought him."—TR.]

12 him bread, and he did eat, and they made him drink water. And they gave him
a piece of a cake of figs, and two clusters [cakes] of raisins; and when he had
eaten, his spirit[13] came again to him; for he had eaten no bread, nor drunk any
13 water, three days and three nights. And David said unto him, To whom *belongest*
thou? and whence art thou? And he said, I am a young man of Egypt,[14] servant
to an Amalekite; and my master left me because three days agone[15] I fell sick.
14 We made an invasion *upon* the south of the Cherethites, and upon *the coast* [on
the region] which *belongeth* to Judah, and upon the south of Caleb, and we burned
15 Ziklag with fire. And David said to him, Canst [Wilt] thou bring me down to
this company [troop]?[16] And he said, Swear unto me by God that thou wilt neither
kill me nor deliver me into the hands of my master and I will bring thee down
16 to this company [troop]. And when he had [And he] brought him down, [*ins.*
and] behold, they were spread abroad upon all the earth [over the whole land],
eating and drinking and dancing [revelling][17], because of all the great spoil which
they had taken out of the land of the Philistines and out of the land of Judah.
17 And David smote them from the twilight even [*om.* even] unto the evening of the
next day,[18] and there escaped not a man of them, save four hundred young men,
18 which rode upon camels and fled. And David recovered [rescued] all that the
19 Amalekites had carried away; and David rescued his two wives. And there was
nothing lacking to them, neither small nor great, neither sons nor daughters, neither
[nor] spoil, nor anything that they had taken to them; David recovered all.
20 And David took all the flocks and herds, [;] *which* they drove before those *other*
cattle [they drove before him this flock],[19] and said, This is David's spoil.
21 And David came to the two hundred men, which were so faint that they could
not follow David, whom they[20] had made also [*om.* also] to abide at the brook
Besor. And they went forth to meet David and to meet the people that were with
22 him; and when David came near to the people, he saluted them. Then answered
all the wicked men and *men* of Belial [all the wicked and worthless men], of those
that went with David, and said, Because they went not with us, we will not give
them *ought* [aught] of the spoil that we have recovered, save to every man his
23 wife and his children, that they may lead them *away* and depart. Then said David
[And David said], Ye shall not do so, my brethren, with that which the Lord
[Jehovah] hath given us, who hath preserved us, and delivered the company
24 [troop] that came against us into our hand. For [And] who will hearken unto
you in this matter? but [for] as his part is that goeth down to the battle, so shall
25 his part be that tarrieth by the stuff; they shall part alike. And it was *so* [it
came to pass] from that day forward, that he made it a statute and an ordinance
26 for[21] Israel unto this day. And when [*om.* when] David came to Ziklag, he [and]

[13] [Ver. 12. רוּחַ, not the *nephesh*, the "breath of life," but the breath considered as vigorous and truly alive, somewhat as in Eng. the word "spirit" has come to mean "courageous vigor and alertness."—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 13. Sept. has against connection and accents: "the young man of Egypt said, I am servant," *etc.* —Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 13. Literally: "to-day three," that is, as Chald. gives it, "to-day these three days," and some MSS. have "three days." Vulg. *nudiustertius*.—Tr.]

[16] [Ver. 15. Sept. transfers Γεδδούρ; in other Greek VSS. we find *σύστρεμμα* and λόχος, and also *εὔζωνος* (perhaps, as Schleusner suggests, from the Chald. אדר).—Tr.]

[17] [Ver. 16. Properly "keeping festival."—Tr.]

[18] [Ver. 17. Erdmann renders: "towards the next day" (after Luther), which is doubtful. Eng. A. V. is supported by Vulg., Chald., Sept. Chald., however, instead of using the same word as the Heb., has "the day which was after it," and the Syr. has a similar form "in their rear," as if they read אחר, which does not suggest any good emendation. As the Heb. word stands, the ָם may be regarded as pronom. suffix, "to their morrow" (redundant), or as adverbial ending. Wellhausen emends the text and reads לְהַחֲרִמָם, which would suit the letters of the present word, but does not particularly commend itself.—Tr.]

[19] [Ver. 20. So Erdmann renders, reading (with Vulg. and Then.) לְפָנָיו instead of לִפְנֵי. The sense will be still better if we further read in the beginning of the verse: "And they took," instead of "And David took." The taking and driving seem to be the work of the same person (as Wellh. remarks), and it would be appropriate for David's men rather than for himself to set aside his spoil. This change would require very little alteration of the lettering. As for the words: "this flock," they seem unnecessary (Wellh. would reject them as clerical explanation), yet do not interfere materially with the sense.—Tr.]

[20] [Ver. 21. The Sing. "he" is found in some MSS., and in Sept., Syr., Arab., Vulg., Chald., and is better.—At the end of the verse instead of אֶת־הָעָם, the VSS. and some MSS. have אֶל.—Tr.]

[21] [Ver. 25. There is a good deal of authority (about forty MSS., several printed Edd., and the Vulg.) for reading "in Israel," which is better.—Tr.]

sent of the spoil unto the elders of Judah, *even* to [*om.* even to] his friends, saying,
27 Behold a present for you of the spoil of the enemies of the Lord [Jehovah]: To
them which were in Bethel, and to them which were in south Ramoth [in Ramoth-
28 negeb], and to them which were in Jattir, And to them which were in Aroer, and
29 to them which were in Siphmoth, and to them which were in Eshtemoa, And to
them which were in Rachal, and to them which were in the cities of the Jerah-
30 meelites, and to them which were in the cities of the Kenites, And to them which
were in Hormah, and to them which were in Chor[22]-ashan, and to them which were
31 in Athach, And to them which were in Hebron, and to all the places where David
himself and his men were wont to haunt [which David frequented, he and his
men].

[22] [Ver. 30. "Bor" is found in Sept., Syr., Vulg. and a number of Edd. and MSS., and is preferred by De Rossi and Wellhausen.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1–6. Description of the *calamity* inflicted by the Amalekites, who plundered and burned Ziklag, the *grief of David* and his men at their loss, the *danger* to which he was exposed from the exasperated people who threw the blame on him, and his *strengthening* in the Lord.—The construction of the four first verses is as follows: the protasis extends through the three first verses, but with two parentheses, the first extending from "and the Amalekite," in ver. 1 to the end of ver. 2, the second including all of ver. 3 after the word "behold;" the apodosis is ver. 4.—*On the third day,* namely, after his departure from Achish. The Amalekites had used David's absence and the defenceless condition of Ziklag to revenge themselves for his invasion of their territory (xxvii. 8). **The south and Ziklag**, the general term preceding the particular. The *Negeb* is the south-country, so called by the Israelites as being the southern part of Palestine or Judah, while it was north of the Amalekite territory. According to ver. 13 they had plundered Ziklag three days before David's return. In verse 2 only the women are said to have been carried away; the children, mentioned in vers. 3, 6, are omitted here for brevity's sake. The Sept.'s addition to the text of the words "and all" is unnecessary (against Thenius).* So the words "nor woman" after "man" are an explanatory insertion of the Sept. It is expressly remarked that the women *were not slain*, because they intended to make slaves of them and the children [in contrast with David's conduct, xxvii. 11.—Tr.]. The *two wives of David*, Ahinoam and Abigail, are especially named, xxv. 42 sq., xxvii. 3. The *great sorrow* that they *all*, David and his men, expressed with tears and cries, corresponds with the *great peril* that threatened David, the people charging their misfortune on him and thinking of **stoning him.—The soul of all the people was bitter**, they were deeply agitated. **But he strengthened himself in the Lord his God**, he had recourse to Him in order (ver. 7 sq.) **to inquire of him by the ephod**, as he had done, xxiii. 9. His strengthening in the Lord consisted in the fact that, being assured through his inquiry of the Lord's assistance, he straightway set out with his embittered men to recover the spoil from the Amalekites.

* [On this reading see "Textual and Grammatical."—Tr.]

Vers. 7–10. David's *arrangements* to secure his end: 1) the *religious preparation*, verses 7, 8; he first assured himself of the Lord's *will* that he should pursue the enemy, and of His *promise* that he should be successful,—on the words "bring me the ephod," which indicate that the ephod was exclusively the property of the high-priest,* comp. Hengst., Beit. [Contributions, *etc.*] 3, 67 sq.,—2) his *military disposition* of his men, vers. 9, 10. The six hundred men appear here as before. They are divided into two parts, four hundred pursue the enemy, two hundred remain behind, when they have reached the *brook Besor*. [But this arrangement was not at first intended by David; it was a necessity forced on him by the exhaustion of the two hundred.—Tr.]. The brook Besor is probably the present Wady el Sheria, which begins in the hill-country of Judah and flows in a south-westerly direction south of Gaza into the sea. See Raumer, *Pal.* p. 52. [Rob. thought it the Wady Ar arah, and Grove and Porter think it yet unidentified.—Tr.].—At this brook and in its valley—both must be considered here, because the staying behind of some of David's men, afterwards referred to their exhaustion, supposes an insurmountable difficulty in the ground—"the rest" (הַנּוֹתָרִים ver. 9) remained in a position adapted to the protection of the baggage which was left here (see ver. 24). The narrator here anticipates what is told in ver. 10; it is a proleptical expression, arising from the vivacious description of David's rapid march with four hundred men, and there is no need to change the text into the Vulg. *lassi* "wearied" (= הַפְּגָרִים), as Then. proposes, especially as the ancient VSS. had it and explained it by periphrases (Keil).† The verb (פָּגַר) = "to be weary" in Syr., occurs only here and in ver. 21. Weariness was the reason of their remaining behind. At the same time they served to guard the baggage (ver. 24).

Vers. 11–16 *a*. David gets information of the Amalekites from an Egyptian straggler. Ver. 11. **And they found an Egyptian**; from the proximity of Egypt the Amalekites had Egyptians as slaves (comp. ver. 13). **And they took**, that is, brought him to David, a pregnant expression in keeping with the rapidity of the action. The insertion of the Sept. "and they brought him," is clearly an explanatory reading (against Then.).

* [The inquiry was probably conducted by the high-priest in a way unknown to us, but more probably the answer came through the priest's mouth.—Tr.]

† [See "Text. and Gram.—Tr.]

"Bread" (לֶחֶם) = food; they gave him *to eat and to drink;*" the general statement stands first.—Ver. 12. The sort of food which they gave him. On the "fig-cakes" see on xxv. 18. **His spirit returned to him**, he revived; having been left behind sick, and having been three days and three nights without food, he had lain exhausted on the field.*—Ver. 13 sq. The Egyptian's answer. **To whom belongest thou?** that is, as slave, for as such he was recognized by his exterior. "Whence art thou?" (אֵי מִזֶּה, the אֵי remains unchanged, the מִזֶּה changes according to the relations of the sentence. Ew. § 326 *a*).—"We invaded;" the verb here only stands with the Accus., usually with a Prep. (בְּ, אֶל, עַל, see ver. 16).—*The first geographical statement* [ver. 14]: **On the south of the Cherethites**,† *a Philistine tribe* dwelling in the south and on the sea (see ver. 16), which came originally, as the name indicates, from the island of Crete. See in Steph. Byzant. *s.v. Gaza*, the tradition that the Cretans under Minos made an expedition against the neighboring coast of Gaza. Reasons for the view that *Caphtor*, the home of the Philistines (who were not indigenous to Canaan, but immigrants, Deut. ii. 23; Amos ix. 7), is identical with *Crete*, may be seen in Bertheau *zur Gesch. d. Israel.*, p. 186–200. Comp. Ewald *Gesch.* [Hist. of Israel] I. 336. Against this view see Starke's *Gaza*, p. 66 sq., 99 sq., Dunker's *Gesch. d. Alterthums* I., 339 A. [See also Vaihinger's Article "*Philister*," and Müller's Art. "*Kanaan*" in Herzog's *R.-E.*, and Müller's more recent book "*Die Semiten*," in which he wrongly makes the Philistines Japhethites. The whole question is obscure, but there is some ground for holding that the Philistines first passed from the neighborhood of the Persian Gulf into Lower Egypt (Gen. x. 14, "*whence* came the Philistines"), thence through Crete to Canaan, to which country they have given the name Palestine. This would explain the Phœnician-Canaanitish type of their language.—Tr.].‡—*The second statement:* **On what pertained to Judah**, the southern regions of Judah, forming the eastern portion of the Negeb or Southland, which stretched across from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea. *The third statement:* **On the south of Caleb**.—*Caleb*, one of the twelve spies, as reward for his faithfulness and believing courage, he alone with Joshua, daring, and advising the people, to enter the land (Num. xiii. 6, 30: xiv. 6 sq.), was, with Joshua, alone considered worthy to tread the land of promise; the city of Hebron and its environs was given to him and his posterity as a lasting possession. When the city of Hebron was afterwards assigned to the priests, the race of Caleb yet retained all the adjacent fields and villages (Josh. xxi. 11 sq.). Though it belonged to the tribe-territory of Judah, the district of Caleb is regarded as a distinct region; it formed the eastern part of the Negeb as far as the Dead Sea, comp. xxv. 3. The three regions, which the Amalekites invaded, are named from West to East. We hence see that the plundering expedition of the Amalekites extended over the whole South-country, and was not intended for Ziklag alone.—Ver. 15. David's question: **Wilt thou bring me down to this troop?** supposes the Amalekites had marched southward, and dwelt there south of Judah and Philistia. The Egyptian assures himself by an oath (by "Elohim," not by "Jehovah"), from David **that he will not kill him**, "because informers and guides, after having been used, were often so disposed of" (Thenius), and **that he would not deliver him up to his master**, because the latter would have killed him for his service to David.—Ver. 16 *a* assumes that David gave him the oath. **He brought him down**.—It is unnecessary (with Sept. and Then.) to insert "thither." Though the slave was left behind sick, he yet knew the direction which "this troop" had taken.

Vers. 16 *b*–20. David surprises the Amalekites and recovers the booty. Ver. 16 *b*. After "behold" we ought perhaps to suppose "they" (הֵמָּה) fallen out (so Then. after Sept.). The narrative gives a lively description of the Amalekite troop, scattered over the ground (so David found them), revelling after their successful foray, and "*celebrating a feast because of all the great spoil*."—Ver. 17. Thus abandoned to jollity David surprises them. The statement: **from the twilight to the evening** is understood by some to mean from the *morning*-twilight, by others to mean from the *evening*-twilight, the Heb. word (נֶשֶׁף) being used in both senses, for example, in the former in Job vii. 4. In favor of the *morning-twilight* is 1) that David could only have surprised the revelling Amalekites by a night-march; and 2) the counter-limit: "*to the evening*." Luther: "from morning to evening." The succeeding word (לְמָחֳרָתָם) means not "on the following day," but (because of the Prep.) "*towards* the next day" (Luth.) According to the former rendering the fight would have lasted two whole days, which is improbable. According to the latter it lasted (as agrees with the circumstances) only one day, from morning to evening, when according to Heb. reckoning the following day began. The suffix (ָם), which the ancient VSS., except Syr. and Arab.,* do not express, is perhaps an adverbial ending† (Maurer, Ges., Then., Keil). That David had to fight the Amalekites a whole day shows that after the first surprise in the twilight they made obstinate resistance. [Instead of "the next day," *Bib.-Com.* proposes to read "to wipe them out" (לְמוּחוֹתָם), and similarly Wellhausen. The present text is difficult. The addition "towards the morrow" (Erdmann) is unnecessary, and the phrase itself is strange, though sustained by the ancient versions. No explanation yet proposed is satisfactory.—Tr.].—Ver. 18 sq. Statement of David's complete success; he recovered all the goods and persons that the Amalekites had carried away.—Ver. 20. **All the sheep and oxen** David

---

* [Wordsworth (*Comm. in loco.*), sees in this a type of Christ's mercy to the outcast. The two procedures are both examples of kindness, but there is no typical relation between them.—Tr.]

† הַכְּרֵתִי — כְּרֵתִים, Ezek. xxv. 16; Zeph. ii. 6, used as synonymous with the Philistines.

‡ [David's bodyguard (2 Sam. viii. 18) was probably composed of Philistines.—Tr.]

* They, however, read מֵאַחֲרֵיהֶם.

† As in יוֹמָם, חִנָּם.

took away, namely, from the Amalekites, not merely what they had taken from him, but other rich booty in cattle. "That flock" (הַמִּקְנֶה הַהוּא) [Eng. A. V. wrongly "those other cattle"] is *not* the flock that belonged to David, and was now recovered by him from the Amalekites. So some expositors take it, explaining it that David caused the flocks captured from the Amalekites to be driven *before* the rest which belonged to him, with the cry: "this is the spoil of David;" but there is no previous special mention of stolen cattle which would justify such a retrospective designation: "before that (David's) flock." "That flock," in such a demonstrative or retrospective sense, can only be the previously-mentioned cattle captured from the enemy [ver. 19]. Nor can we render with De Wette "they *marched*," properly "they led," that is, led the train of women and children; for the verb (נָהַג), as Thenius properly remarks in opposition, "never (even Gen. xxxi. 18; Ex. iii. 1; Isa. xi. 16; Ps. lxxx. 2 (1) Song of Songs viii. 2) means *lead* except in so far as the leader is at the same time the driver (so vers. 2, 22; 2 Sam. vi. 3), and never means draw forward, lead on." Taking the verb in the sense of "driving," there is, however, no object to the verb in the Heb. text (לִפְנֵי); the "women and children" cannot be the object, since only cattle has been spoken of. We must therefore (with Then. after Vulg.) make a slight change in the text (read לְפָנָיו) and render: "*they* (the drivers) *drove* (or, one drove) *before him*," that is, before David (who stood of course at the head of the troop) *this flock*, namely, that which had been captured from the Amalekites, to which the outcry "this is David's spoil" answers very well.*

Vers. 21–25. David's return with the recovered property and the booty to the two hundred men who were left behind, and the adjustment of a strife which was made by some wicked men of his band in regard to the division of the booty with them.—Ver. 21. **Follow David**, more precise statement of what is said in ver. 10, that they could not go over the brook Besor for weariness. The Sing. "*he* made to abide" (found in all ancient VSS. except Chald., and in 5 MSS. of De Rossi) instead of the Plu. is preferable (Then.), not only because it pertained to David to permit them to stay behind, but also because he is mentioned immediately before and after. David, who had left the tired two hundred to guard the baggage, now gives them friendly greeting as they come joyfully to meet him. On the phrase "he saluted them," lit., "asked after their peace," see xxv. 5; Judg. xviii. 15.—Ver. 22. But in this joyful meeting a discordant note was introduced by certain "wicked and worthless persons" of the band, who had marched with David against the enemy and fought them. The translation of the Sept. "the men of war" is obviously an explanation, and does not require (Then.) a corresponding change in the Heb. text (אַנְשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה). The Sing. "with me" refers to the individual man who speaks in the name of the rest [Eng. A. V., *ad sensum* "with us."—Tr.]. **Because they went not**, because they did not share the danger, they shall not share the spoil, but each one must content himself with his wife and children. The "every one" (אִישׁ) is not dependent on "we will give" [as Eng. A. V. has it], so as to read, "we will give them nothing, *except to every man* his wife, *etc.*", but the proper translation is (Thenius): "but every one his wife and children, these let them lead away, *etc.*", because the "every one" (אִישׁ) is too far from the "to them" (לָהֶם) to be governed by the preposition "to."—Ver. 23. In a gentle and friendly way David repels their demand. By the address "*my brethren*" he speaks to their hearts, and at the same time alludes to the fraternal association in which they all stand with one another, so that they that remained behind must receive their share by fraternal division. **Do not so, my brethren, by that which the Lord has given us.**—אֵת is not Prep. = "*with* that which" (De Wette), but the sign of the Acc. [= "in respect to that which" freely rendered "with" as in Eng. A. V.—Tr.]. Ewald, taking it as Acc., renders the phrase as an ejaculatory oath "by that which . . . !" (*Gr.*, § 329 *a*), and so as an exclamation: "*think on that which.*" In favor of this translation, instead of the usual "*in respect to that which*" is partly the interpunction (a strong pause at the word "my brethren," אֶחָי), as even Then. admits, partly the excited feeling with which David speaks notwithstanding his friendly and gentle tone, so that this rendering cannot be rejected (Then.) as "less natural."* Translate "*for* he has guarded us, *etc.*" (the ו in וַיִּשְׁמֹר as *causal*).—Ver. 24. **And who will hearken to you in this word**; we must here beyond doubt render "*word*" (דָּבָר) and not "thing" [as in Eng. A. V.] because of the reference to the "word" so emphatically spoken by the men. "For" [כִּי Eng. A. V. "but"] refers to the *negation* involved in the question, the reason for which is given in the following words; according to the sense, therefore, it = "but" or "rather." The Sept. inserts by way of explanation the words: "they are not inferior to us, wherefore," but there is no ground for inserting this into the Heb. text (against Then.). **As is the part . . . so be the part** . . . These words are explained by the brief declaration: **together shall they share**, which ordains the *procedure* corresponding to that *rule*.†—David repels the opposition with *two* arguments, 1) a *divine*, drawn from the so manifestly experienced *goodness* of the Lord, pointing *a*) to the *gift* bestowed on them in this booty; *b*) to the *protection* vouchsafed them; *c*) to the *victory* granted them; 2) a purely *human*, in which *a*) he affirms that no one will support

* [On this reading see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

* [This rendering will hardly commend itself. An oath would naturally be by what God "has done for us," or by His "mercy towards us," not by what He "has given us." Sept. has "after (אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר) the Lord has given us," and Cahen "after what the Eternal has given us." The ordinary rendering seems most satisfactory.—Tr.]

† On כְּ-וּכְ see Ew. § 360, 2 *a*; the second כְּ- is here also more sharply connected by the Waw. Cons., Josh. xiv. 11; Dan. xi. 29.—Instead of K. הוֹרֵד we must of course read הַיֹּרֵד. [The Keth. may be the old form הַוֹּרֵד.—Tr.]

them in their demand, since they were "wicked and worthless people," *b)* in proof of this he points out the equality of soldiers in position and merit, whether they take part in battle, or act as guards of baggage in reserve, and thence *c)* declares the demand of human justice "every one his own," every one shall share in that which has fallen to all together. An admirable speech, which set forth most fitly everything essential, and completely settled the dispute. [See in Patrick's *Comm. in loco.* a citation from Polybius on the ancient rule of partition in war, and the procedure of Publius Scipio, like David's, given in *Polyb.* X., XVI. 5 (*Bib. Comm.*).—Tr.].—Ver. 25. **So it was from that day forward.**—David's decision ruled from thenceforth. "He made it," the Subj. is *David*, not indefinite "*one* made it" (Sept., Vulg., Chald.). [A similar law in Numb. xxxi. 27, only there the division is between the soldiery and those that stayed at home, the former having the advantage. David's rule was perhaps a special application of the general principle; it was in force in the time of the Maccabees (2 Macc. viii. 28, 30). See Bp. Patrick's further illustrations. —The translation "upwards," referring back to Abraham, Gen. xiv. 23, 24 (Rashi cited by Gill), is plainly wrong.—Tr.]

Vers. 26–31. The dividing out of the booty—Ver. 26. David retained enough of the booty in the division among his own men, to send considerable presents to **the elders of Judah, his friends.**—The territory of the tribe of Judah had been the scene of his wanderings during his persecution by Saul; see the express reference to this in ver. 31. Here only his kingdom could and was to come to historical realization through the adhesion to him of the *elders* of Judah and through them of the whole people. Because they were his "*friends*," *therefore* he sent them presents from the spoil taken from Judah's old hereditary enemies; he did not send them gifts to make them his friends. [Probably for both reasons.—Tr.]. It is besides probable that many localities in Judah had been plundered by the Amalekites in this foray. F. W. Krummacher: "This was already a royal act in vivid anticipation of his impending accession to the throne. Already the crown of Israel was unmistakably though dimly visible above his head." David's point of view in sending these gifts is declared expressly to be the religious-theocratic in his accompanying words: **Behold a gift of blessing for you of the spoil of the enemies of the Lord.**—"Blessing" (בְּרָכָה) = "gift" which comes from God (see xxv. 27). The enemies, from whom the booty was taken, he calls *enemies of Jehovah*, because they were enemies of God's people and so of God's cause and kingdom in Israel, yea, of God Himself, who as covenant-God identified Himself with His people. Israel's conflict against its enemies was a "conflict of the Lord," see on xvii. 47. The booty taken in battle from the Amalekites by the Lord's help was therefore a gift of God and thus a "*blessing*," in which all Judah, where was the factual foundation for David's kingdom, was to share through its elders and in all its separate localities. It must, therefore, have been a very *rich* booty, as we might also infer from the long duration of the battle.—The term *Judah* embraces all the territory of that tribe, together with certain after-mentioned cities of Simeon scattered on the south border of Judah, as in Josh. xv. 21 sq. some cities of Simeon are mentioned among the cities of Judah.—Ver. 27. *Bethel* cannot (according to ver. 31) be the city in Benjamin (now Beitin); the Sept. Vat. has *Baithsour*, which Then. would adopt into the text as *Beth-sur*, the name of a city in the hill-country of Judah between Jerusalem and Hebron (Josh. xv. 58; 2 Chron. xi. 7), which, however, is undesirable from the great difference between the syllables *el* and *sur*. It is probably the same place which is called *Kesil* in Josh. xv. 30, identical with the Simeonite town called in Josh. xix. 4 *Bethul* and mentioned in 1 Chron. iv. 30 between *Tolad* and *Hormah* under the name *Bethuel;* according to Knobel = Elusa or el Khalasa, now a large ruin about twelve miles south of Beersheba, comp. Rob. I. 333 sq. [Am. Ed. I. 201, 202], Fay [in Lange's *Biblework*] and Keil on Josh. xv. 30, V. Raumer, 180.—*Ramoth-Negeb*, so called, in distinction from other cities of the same name, as lying in the "south-country" belonging to Simeon, Josh. xix. 8. ["Shimei the Ramathite (1 Chr. xxvii. 27), who was over David's vineyards, was evidently a native of this Ramah" (*Bib. Comm.*). —Tr.].—*Jattir*, probably the present *Attir*, Rob. II. 422 [Am. Ed. I. 494, II. 204], a priestly city, Josh. xv. 48; xxi. 14; 1 Chron. vi. 42, in the southern part of the hill-country of Judah, in Eusebius' time (*Onom. s. v.* Jether) a large place inhabited by Christians, twenty Roman miles from Eleutheropolis, called in Seetzen, *R.* III., S. 6, Ater.—Ver. 28. *Aroer*, 1 Chron. xi. 44, in Judah, now a city with colossal ruins of foundation-walls in Wady Ar'ara, about six miles south-east of Beersheba and eight miles south of Hebron, *Rob.* III. 180 [Am. Ed. II. 199].—*Siphmoth*, not identified, not = *Shepham* on the north-border of Canaan, Num. xxxiv. 10, 11, the places here mentioned being all in the south (see ver. 31), according to Keil, "perhaps found in Zebdi the *Siphmite* in 1 Chron. xxvii. 27." [*Bib. Comm. in loco.* remarks on the number of cases in which David's officials are the companions of his youth.—Tr.]. —*Eshtemoa*, now the large village *Semua*, according to Schubert 2225 feet above the level of the sea, on the south-western part of the hill-country of Judah, *Rob.* II. 422, III. 191 [Am. Ed. I. 494, II. 204, 205], with numerous remains of walls, once a priestly city (Josh. xv. 50; xxi. 14).—Ver. 29. *Rachal*, unknown. Instead of this the Sept. has five different names: Ged, Kimath, Saphek, Themath, Karmel, which Thenius would insert in the text, supposing that they might easily have fallen out through the repetition of the phrase "to them which" (וְלַאֲשֶׁר). But only two of these names (Gad and Karmel) are found elsewhere, and Then. is obliged therefore to suppose changes in the original Greek forms* in order to get known names. But besides the complicated character of these changes, the conjecture is opposed by the fact that Gath, as a Philistine city,

* He says: We must very probably read קִינָה (Josh. xv. 22) for קִימָה, אֲפֵק (Josh. xv. 53) for סבק, and perhaps תִּמְנָה (Josh. xv. 57) for תימת. So Buns. and Ew., except that instead of תימת the latter reads דּוּמָה (Josh. xv. 52).

cannot according to ver. 26 come into consideration here. And so the conjecture that *Rachal* is a corruption of *Karmel* is untenable.—The cities of the Jerahmeelites and the Kenites were in the south of Judah (xxvii. 10).—Ver. 30. *Hormah*. in Judah, also in the Negeb or south-country (Josh. xv. 30), assigned to the Simeonites according to Josh. xix. 4, called by the Canaanites Zephath (Judg. i. 17), situated on the southern declivity of the mountains of the Amalekites or the Amorites, now called Sepata [the pass es-Sufa, *Rob.* ii. 181,—Tr.], a ruin on the western declivity of the elevated plateau Rakhma, five miles south of Khalasa (Elusa), see Ritter 14, 1085 [Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, Art. Hormah; see Josh. xii. 14.—Tr.]. Comp. Num. xiv. 45; xxi. 3, the latter as to the meaning of the name: banning, ban-place.—*Chor-ashan* probably=*Ashan** (Josh. xv. 42), according to Josh. xix. 7 a city of Simeon (1 Chron. iv. 32).—*Athach*, only here, otherwise unknown; Then. conjectures the reading to be Ether (עֶתֶר), a Simeonite city (Josh. xix. 7; xv. 43), which is possible from the similarity of the third letters [ך, ר]. In ver. 30 the Sept. has Jarmuth for Hormah, and inserts two additional names, Beer-sheba (Josh. xv. 28; xix. 2) and Nombe, for which Then. refers to the Nuba visited by Tobler.—Ver. 31. *Hebron*, fourteen miles south of Jerusalem, a primeval city (Gen. xxiii. 17; Num. xiii. 22), in a deep and narrow valley in the hill-country of Judah, now *el Khalil*, that is, Friend of God, so called with reference to Abraham's residence there.—**And to all places**, *etc.*—David showed himself grateful to all who befriended and adhered to him as a fugitive, and bound them still closer to him.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. It is a wonderful providence of God in the development of the parallel-running fates of Saul and David that, just before the catastrophe which overwhelmed Saul and his house and kingdom, the ways of *both* men seem to sink into the depths of misfortune, and lose themselves without a trace, Saul's way in battle with the Philistines, David's in hostilities with the Amalekites. And so the nation Israel, already divided in fact between Saul and David, seems to be carried along to destruction with its two heads, and given up beyond salvation to its two mightiest hereditary foes. And on both sides God's punitive justice is seen controlling human sin, for not only Saul, on whose head God's final judgment of wrath descends, is guilty, David's strait also is the result of his sin. This consisted 1) in his sinful weakness of faith and despair, which led him to have recourse to Israel's enemy, instead of remaining trustfully in Judah according to the Lord's direction (xxii. 5); 2) in his untruthfulness and prevarication, which led him to join the enemy against his own people, the Amalekites meantime, while he was marching north, plundering his possessions in the south, and 3) in his extremely cruel and bloody foray against the Amalekites (xxvii.), for which he had received no commission from the Lord, by which their vengeance was kindled against him. All this teaches us, as we look at David and at Saul, that sin is destruction. And yet, notwithstanding this similarity in suffering, which appears, on the one hand, as a divine punishment, and, on the other hand, in sin as cause of destruction, there is here completed to the eye that can recognize God's ways, in a summary and epoch-making manner that most important contrast, whose history runs through the whole development of the kingdom of God in the Old Covenant and in the New. Saul's way vanishes in the darkness of an unfortunate battle with the old enemy of the nation, into whose hand God gives him and the people, and his life ends in despair; the sentence of rejection is executed. David's way emerges from the gloom, he returns as victor over the foe, dispenses presents with princely munificence, his kingdom flourishes in the south over the whole territory of the mighty tribe of Judah, whose power southward against the tribes of which Amalek was the most dangerous in its enmity, and westward against the powerful Philistines, was the protection and guard of all Israel. While's Saul's star sinks in the north, the star of David rises in the south, and there begins the long line of fulfillments of the prophecy concerning the Star that should come out of Jacob (Num. xxiv. 17). While in the north Israel, involved in Saul's destruction and the divine judgment passed against him, lies prostrate before the Philistines, David's victory frees the south from the enemy, and in Judah the foundation of the new kingdom of the future is laid by the heroic achievement of David and his men, and by his noble and winning behaviour. This great contrast in the fates of Saul and David is, however, founded in the contrast in their posture of heart to the Lord: Saul has lost sight of God, hardened himself against Him in pride, self-will and hate to David, lost ethical ability to repent, and in his time of need applied to anti-godly powers and deceitful human counsel. David, on the contrary, shows us his heart, as it bows in sorrow before Him (ver. 4) under the painful, but not undeserved strokes of God's hand (vers. 5, 6), but in the bitterest experiences, when his own men turn against him, does not yield to despair, but looks to the Lord for strength. And so he receives the consolatory revelation of God's will and promise of divine help, and experiences the Lord's saving and blessing power. From these gloomy paths David comes forth as a man after God's own heart, to whom has come the experience that God gives grace to the humble and causes the upright to succeed.

2. *The strengthening of the inner life in the Lord in time of need* (as David here found) consists in the undoubtful experience and knowledge of what is well-pleasing to God through enlightenment from above, in fulfilling it with pious confidence and hope in His help through the consolations of His word, and in the permeation of one's own will by the sanctifying might of the divine will, which lifts up the sunken courage, and makes the crushed or depressed will to mount to bold resolution and energetic action. Such a strengthening attests itself particularly in the casting of all care on Him, and in brave struggle against all the powers of flesh and blood,

* [A priestly city, 1 Chron. vi. 44 (Eng. A. V. vi. 59).—Tr.]

which oppress and take captive the inner life. The *condition* of such an inspiriting and strengthening of the inner life of the member of God's kingdom is his open-heartedness and receptivity for the divine vital powers, which are at the disposal of every one who *will* appropriate them, and constant intercourse with the Lord in unchangeable association of life with him founded on thorough humble devotion to him, without which neither can man be God's property, nor God man's; all this being involved in the words: "David strengthened himself in the Lord *his God*."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1. SCHLIER: What else were the Amalekites than the Lord's rods of chastening, to chasten David for all his improprieties in the land of the Philistines? For whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth, and with His children He is always strictest.—BERL. BIB.: God does not leave His people long in sin, but soon raps them over the knuckles when they go off on their own ways, in order that they may come into the track again.—S. SCHMID: When we go out of the house we should heartily pray, for we know not in what manner we shall return.—Ver. 2. STARKE: That is God's custom in dealing with His people; before He exalts them, He humbles them first. Prov. xv. 33; 1 Sam. ii. 7.—CRAMER: God still cares for His own, and lays on them no more trouble than they can bear (1 Cor. x. 13), and also restrains their enemies from making their cross heavier by a hair.—Vers. 3–5. BERL. BIB.: David was guided in a way so universal, that one cannot experience nor even know anything which was not to be found in him. And those who shall read attentively what is said of David, will therein certainly meet with their own condition; and this the more exactly, in proportion as they have gone further and become more conformed to Jesus Christ.—[Ver. 4. HENRY: It is no disparagement to the boldest and bravest spirits to lament the calamities of relations and friends.—TR.]—Ver. 6 sqq. SCHLIER: David was strong in the Lord and in the power of His might, for in prayer he had won over again the Lord his God and gained His gracious promise. —[TAYLOR: As sometimes the partially intoxicated man will be sobered in a moment by the occurrence of some terrible calamity, so David, who had been living all these months under the narcotic influence of sin, was by the violence of the Amalekites and the threatened mutiny of his own men roused to his nobler self, and he "strengthened himself in the Lord his God."—TR.]—BERLENB. BIBLE: He strengthens himself in God through an increased composure and through the union of his will with the will of God, as himself doing or permitting all this.—ROOS: David saw no means before him of recovering his wives, children and property and those of his followers. But he strengthened himself in faith in the omniscience, wisdom and almightiness of God, and obtained through the Light and Right [Urim and Thummim] good instruction from God. Now as David did, so should the believing seed of Abraham in every need. We should not give way to gloomy unbelief, but strengthen ourselves in our God. We should and may do this all the more because the heart of God is in Christ Jesus or revealed to us yet more clearly than to David.—Ver. 8. BERL. BIBLE: If it was a duty under the Old Testament, in an enterprise pertaining to war, thus to turn first to God before resolving on anything, that yet the spirit of the Old Testament carried along with it, and did not absolutely forbid, how much more among Christians under the New Testament should nothing of the sort be done without the divine consent, without first duly consulting thereupon with Christ and His Spirit. [TAYLOR: Very suggestive is this contrast. "David said, I shall one day perish by the hand of Saul; there is nothing better for me than that I should speedily escape to the land of the Philistines." "David strengthened himself in the Lord his God, and said unto Abiathar, Bring hither the ephod." On the one hand despair, leading to prayerlessness and self-will; on the other, faith, leading to prayer and eager willinghood to submit to the guidance of Jehovah.-TR.].—Vers. 9, 10, HEDINGER: He hopes in vain for consolation from God, who will not make use of God's counsel.—S. SCHMID: As man acts towards God so God acts towards man (Levit. xxvi. 27, 28).—SCHLIER: As David humbled himself before God, God also acknowledged him again and took him up.—We men cannot enough humble ourselves before the Lord, but neither can we have enough confidence in the Lord.—Ver. 11. HEDINGER [from HALL]: Worldly wisdom teacheth us to sow small courtesies where we may reap large harvests of recompense.—Verses 13, 14 [from HALL]: Wonderful is the providence of God, even over those that are not in the nearest bonds His own.—Ver. 16 [from HALL]: Destruction is never nearer than when security has chased away fear. The world passes away with its lust; well for him who is on his guard and seeks in time what promotes his peace.—Ver. 17. CRAMER: God blesses the possessions of the pious and causes all to go well with them (Ps. i. 3, 4).—Vers. 18, 19. God gives more than we could have desired and hoped for from Him.—SCHLIER: Only for children of God who in trying times seek the Lord does it hold good, that when the need is highest God's help is also nighest. We will never forget that a few days after David's own people were about to stone him on the ruins of Ziklag, the royal crown was laid at his feet.—[Ver. 24. This principle will apply to soldiers and non-combatants, ministers and their wives, missionaries and those at home who sustain them.—Ver. 26. How delightful when the prompting of gratitude for the past coincides with the dictate of policy for the future.—TR.]

Vers. 3–8. *Right behaviour before God in need and anguish:* 1) These men do not pretend to stoical indifference, but let their *grief* have free course, as *the Lord* has brought it on them (ver. 4); 2) They bow *low in humility* under the *hand of God*, renouncing all self-help, and seeing human support vanish before their eyes (ver. 6 *a*); 3) They lift themselves *cheerfully* up again in *power and strength*, procured from the Lord (ver. 6 *b*–8).

Vers. 6–20. *The Lord is His people's mighty rock of defence against the opposers of his kingdom:* 1) He gives them his *counsel* upon their *inquiry* when in

straits; 2) He fills them with his *power* for the *conflict* enjoined upon them; 3) He leads them according to his *promises* to glorious *victory;* 4) He causes them to come forth from the conflict with a rich *blessing.*

The Lord's help in great need: 1) *To whom is it given?* a) To him who betakes himself to the Lord with prayerful *inquiry* (ver. 7); *b*) To him who humbly gives himself up to the Lord's *guidance*; *α*) in obedience to His *commandment; β*) in trust upon His *promises* (ver. 8). 2) *How does the Lord render His help?* *a*) Through His *word* —answering the inquiries addressed to Him in need—putting an end to uncertainty by its decision—banishing all anxiety and despondency from the heart of consoling promises (ver. 8); *b*) Through His *deed*—in often quite unexpectedly pointing out the right *ways and means* that lead to the end (vers. 11–16)—in often wonderfully rendering his assistance amid threatening perils (ver. 17 sq.)—and in causing a *rich gain* to be obtained from the most trying times of need.

The subjects of God's kingdom in conflict with the world: 1) They *enter into* the conflict, strengthened in the strength of the Lord; 2) They *conquer* in the conflict, under the guidance and support of the Lord; 3) They *come out* of the conflict, crowned with the rich blessing of the Lord.

[Ver. 11. *The forsaken slave:* 1) Even the meanest may not be neglected with impunity. 2) Even the poorest may richly reward his benefactors. 3) Even the weakest may be the means of accomplishing great results (David's recovering possessions and family, regaining the devotion of his followers, and reviving the friendship of his tribesmen, thus smoothing his way to the throne). 4) Even the lowliest is cared for by Providence, and his fortunes linked with the highest, in the providential network of society.

[Vers. 1–26. *Returning Home—Two Pictures.* I. The sorrowful return. 1) He had left home without seeking the Lord's guidance—apparently to fight against the Lord's people—uncertain and unhappy. 2) He had returned, because distrusted, and sent away in dishonor. 3) He found his home in ashes, and his family carried captive. 4) His personal wretchedness was enhanced by the natural wrath of his followers. II. The subsequent joyful return. 1) He leaves with explicit Divine direction and promise—to fight national as well as private enemies—hopeful and happy. 2) He returns victorious and honored. 3) He has regained greater wealth than he had lost. 4) His personal joy is increased by the privilege of sending gifts to his friends. And now what unites the two pictures; His sorrowful return led him to deep penitence, revived faith (ver. 6) and humble prayer (ver. 8); and from these resulted the joyful return. Sore afflictions, when rightly borne, often open the way to life's sweetest joy.—Tr.]

IV. *Death and Burial of Saul and his Sons.*

Chapter XXXI. 1–13. [Comp. 1 Chron. X.]

1 Now [And] the Philistines fought[1] against Israel, and the men of Israel fled
2 from before the Philistines and fell down slain[2] in mount Gilboa. And the Philis-
tines followed hard[3] upon Saul and upon his sons; and the Philistines slew Jona-
3 than and Abinadab and Melchishua,[4] Saul's sons. And the battle went sore
against Saul and the archers[5] hit him, and he was sore wounded [sore afraid] of
4 the archers. Then said Saul [And Saul said] unto his armour-bearer, Draw thy
sword and thrust me through therewith, lest these uncircumcised come and thrust

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. The Partcp. is found also in the Syr. and Chald. ("the Phil. were breaking out in war"). The parallel passage, 1 Chr. x. 1, has the Perf., which Wellh. prefers here on the ground that the statement is too important to be made in the form of an adjectival sentence; but the principal thought in the mind of the writer was Saul's death, not the fact of the battle.—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 1. Erdmann: "And there fell down slain men," which is so far better, as the Eng. A. V. seems to represent all the men of Israel as falling down slain. But this general, indefinite phrase, would not be strange in Heb.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 2. On the form of the verb (omission of the *i* in the Hiph. Impf.) see Ew. § 232) *c* 2. Ges. § 53, 3, Rem. 4. Green § 94 *c*. The other examples of this shortening (which is regular in Aramaic) are 1 Sam. xiv. 22; Jerem. ix. 2.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 2. Sept. writes these names Aminadab and Melchisa, which are misreadings of the text. The difference of pronunciation in the second name (*e* instead of our masoretic *a*) is to be noticed.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 3. Fully: "The archers (or, throwers), men with the bow," in which the אֲנָשִׁים (omitted in 1 Chr. x. 3) makes a grammatical difficulty. But, as its harshness will account for its omission in Chron., and we could not well account for its presence here by clerical error, it is better to retain it as a phrase explanatory of מוֹרִים, which Chron. also explains by the word "bow"—"throwers with the bow."—Wellh. conjectures that מוֹרֶה is not connected with יָרָה, but = מַעֲרָה and means any "caster," coming to the Hebrews from the Phœnicians.—Tr.]

me through[6] and abuse me. But his armour-bearer would not, for he was sore
5 afraid. Therefore [And] Saul took a [the] sword and fell upon it. And when
his armour-bearer saw that Saul was dead, he fell likewise [he also fell] upon his
6 sword and died with him. So Saul died, and his three sons and his armour-bearer
7 and[7] all his men that same day together. And when the men of Israel that were
on the other side of [beyond][8] the valley [plain] and they that were on the other
side [beyond] Jordan saw that the men of Israel fled, and that Saul and his sons
were dead, they forsook the cities and fled; and the Philistines came and dwelt in
them.
8 And it came to pass on the morrow, when the Philistines came to strip the slain,
9 that they found Saul and his three sons fallen in Mount Gilboa. And they cut off
his head and stripped off his armour, and sent[9] into the land of the Philistines round
about, to publish it in the house [houses][10] of their idols and among the people.
10 And they put his armour in the house of Ashtaroth, and they fastened[11] his body
to the wall of Bethshan.[12]
11 And when [om. when] the inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead heard of that which the
12 Philistines had done to Saul, All [And all] the valiant men arose, and went all
night, and took the body of Saul, and the bodies of his sons from the wall of Beth-
13 shan, and came to Jabesh and burnt them there. And they took their bones and
buried them under a tree [the tamarisk] at Jabesh, and fasted seven days.

[6] [Ver. 4. The verb "thrust through" is not found in 1 Chr. x. 4, and Wellh. proposes to omit it here because Saul could not in any case hope to escape this fate at the hands of the enemy. But Saul asks only that he may not be slain by the enemy. Bertheau's view that the word is here a copyist's erroneous repetition of the preceding "thrust through" is replied to by Thenius: if Saul had only feared capture, we should have had in the text besides the "come" some such word as "seise."—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 6. Instead of גַּם several MSS. and one Targum. MS. (De Rossi) read וְגַם "and also all his men." The substitution of "all his house" in 1 Chr. x. 6, for "all his men" does not warrant us in changing this text. Our phrase is not to be considered as a "slight exaggeration," nor as foreign to our author (as, namely, a weakening of the tragic impression made by the simple truth), but as a general phrase — his whole army, not unusual among historical writers.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 7. Instead of "on the other side" or "beyond," Erdmann renders "on the side of," which conveys the sense here, though it is not a literal rendering. The word עֵבֶר means "beyond" (so Gesen. against Fürst) and describes either side of a river according to the position of the speaker or writer; thus it may in some instances — the country on the side of a river or plain. As it apparently here describes the western side of the Jordan, it might seem that the narator lived east of the river (*Bib. Com.*); but this is not necessary, as the phrase may have the general meaning above stated.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 9. Whether they sent messengers (in which case the Qal would be the appropriate form of the verb) or the head and armour (as the Piel of the text would indicate) is doubtful.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 9. There is no reason why we should assimilate the texts of Samuel and Chronicles here, reading אֵת (Chr.) for בֵּית (Sam.). Some MSS., however, give the latter reading in 1 Chr. x. 9, no doubt from the disposition to assimilate.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 10. The Chald. has "suspended" צְלַב — Heb. תלא, which is found in 2 Sam. xxi. 12; the difference in the wording is not unnatural, and we need not read here הֹקִעוּ (from יקע "impale") instead of תָּקְעוּ (Wellhausen).—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 10. On the supposition that this verse and 1 Chr. x. 10 are both parts of a longer statement, various attempts have been made to re-establish the original complete text. Ewald (Gesch. III. 152 *Rem.*) inserts in our verse after "Ashtaroth" the words: "and his skull in the house of Dagon," the Chronicler then inserting תקעו from the last clause. The difficulty in this attempt is not so much to account for the תקעו in Chron. (Wellh.), as to account for the omission of the clause in Sam. Why not state that Saul's skull was hung up in the temple of Dagon? Wellhausen's view that the "body" (גְּוִיָּה) and "skull" (גֻּלְגֹּלֶת) refer to the same fact is in itself not improbable; one account might use the general word "body," the other might mention the most striking part, the "skull." In that case the "Beth-Dagon" must be identified with the "wall of Bethshan" by supposing that the temple of Dagon was in Beth-Shan. This, however, is an improbable supposition, and there remains the view that the two texts were not originally identical, but that the two accounts vary by mentioning different circumstances in the general fact. Wellhausen also holds that the two verses are not constructed from one original text.—Observe that instead of the גְּוִיַּה of Samuel, Chron. has גּוּפָה, perhaps in obedience to a change in good usage.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1–7. *The battle lost. Death of Saul and his sons.*—Ver. 1 is connected with xxix. 1 (comp. xxviii. 1, 4 sq.). The partcp. "were fighting" [so the Heb.] presupposes the account given in xxviii. 1, 4 and xxix. 1 of the preparations for the battle, and thence forms an adjectival sentence, which is to be understood thus: "When now the Philistines," *etc.*, "the men of Israel fled," *etc.* Driven from the place the men of Israel took refuge in mount Gilboa (see xxviii. 4), and were thither followed by the Philistines and slain. [Or, less probably, the mountain itself may have been the scene of battle.—Tr.]—Ver. 2. Sept. renders: "the Philistines press closely on, come up with (συνάπτουσι);" it does not, however, thence follow that they read Impf. Qal (of דבק) with לְ, for

the Hiph. with Acc. (so 1 Chron. x. 2 it is used with the Prep. "after," comp. 1 Sam. xiv. 22; Judg. xx. 45), also means "to hang closely at one's feet, overtake him" (comp. Judg. xviii. 22).—On the three sons of Saul see on xiv. 49.—Ver. 3. "The battle went sore to (אֶל) Saul." It is unnecessary to read "against" (עַל) instead of "to," since the phrase describes the movement of the battle "towards" Saul; the battle was sore "towards" Saul, after his three sons had fallen. [Vulg.: "the whole weight of the battle turned against [or towards] Saul."—Tr.] The archers especially harassed him. **Men with the bow** is in apposition with "shooters" (מוֹרִים). Render: **They hit him** (taken absolutely), not "hit him with the bow," the verb not being elsewhere so used.* **And he was sore afraid** (from חיל or חול), not, as Sept. and Vulg., "was sore wounded," this signification for the verb חלל (= חלה) "being not proved" (Keil). [The signification "wounded" would be permissible but for the masoretic pointing and the following Prep.—Tr.] He "trembled, was frightened" *at the archers*, because, the battle going hard against him, he saw no way of escaping them, or of resisting the enemy's superior force, especially as, since the death of his sons, he was alone with his armor-bearer. And even if we suppose that it was not *despairing fear* that he felt (which, however, after the scene at Endor, might well get control of him, notwithstanding his old heroism of character), but only *failure of resources* (Thenius), yet his fear and trembling at the shame that threatened him (ver. 4) may be easily explained. Thenius thinks that his request to his armor-bearer to kill him is intelligible only on the supposition that he was badly wounded, and so unfit for resistance, and *properly* also for self-destruction. But, as he finally killed himself, he could not have been too badly wounded for this. It is quite in keeping with Saul's condition of soul (abandoned to despair) that, at the mere possibility of being slain by the Philistines he sought death at the hands of his attendant. Clearly in favor of this view, and against the other, is Saul's address to his armor-bearer: **Draw thy sword and pierce me therewith, lest these uncircumcised come and pierce me and abuse me.** Saul had a strong consciousness of the sacredness of his person as the Anointed of the Lord, and must therefore have held it a great shame to be slain by the idolatrous, unclean heathen. **The armor-bearer would not, for he was sore afraid**; he had, indeed, to defend the king's life, and was responsible for its preservation. **And Saul took the sword and fell on it**; that is, having set the hilt on the ground, he threw the weight of his body on the point, and thus killed himself. The scene is clearly and vividly portrayed with a few admirable strokes. [For the meaning of the contrary account 2 Sam. i. 10 see notes on that passage.—Tr.]—Ver. 5. The armor-bearer's fear, here again brought forward, was based, no doubt, on the above-named consideration; he was answerable for the king's person, and might also be apprehensive that he would be regarded as his murderer. He followed his lord's example, and slew himself. At the same time also **all his men were slain.** 1 Chron. x. 6 has "all his house" instead of "all his men." Certainly Abner, who was no doubt in the battle, had not fallen, 2 Sam. xi. 8 (Then.), but that is not inconsistent with the statement, since he, as Saul's General (xiv. 50 sq.) belonged, strictly speaking, neither to the "house" nor to the "men," by which term we must understand the soldiers who were near the king's person, his body-guard, as it were.—Ver. 7. A distinction is here made between the "men of Israel" who were non-combatants and dwelt east of the field of battle, and the "men of Israel" who formed the army. The former are described as those who dwelt "on the side of the plain and on the side of the Jordan."* The "plain" is the lowland between mount Gilboa on the south and little Hermon on the north, the continuation of the plain of Jezreel, into which the battle passed, so that the Israelites fled to mount Gilboa and were there slain. The Jordan with its western bank-terrain formed the border. Those who, from the station of the narrator (which we must take with Keil to be the battle-field in the plain of Jezreel) dwelt beyond, that is, opposite him on the mountain-terrain beside the plain and in the Jordan-flats, fled from their abodes when they saw the total defeat of the Israelitish army in the plain. **They left the cities**; Sept., Vulg., Syr., Chron. read "their cities," a correct interpretation, but not proof of a different original text here (Then.). **And the Philistines came and dwelt in them**, not immediately, before the occurrence of what is next related (Then. against Bertheau), but from now on they took possession of the district with all its cities, settled themselves on the whole north and thence seized the rest of the country, so that they held the whole land except Perea on the east [beyond Jordan] and Judah in the south.

Vers. 8–10. The Philistines' cruel and abusive treatment of the corpses of Saul and his three sons.—Ver. 8. After the anticipatory ethnographic statement in ver. 7 the narrative returns to the field of battle. **And it came to pass on the morrow.**—On the day after the battle, which had therefore probably lasted till evening, the darkness preventing plundering. **On mount Gilboa** they found Saul and his sons fallen (comp. ver. 1), the Israelitish army, and with it Saul and his sons, having fallen back thither from the plain before the victorious Philistines.—Ver. 9. Comp. 1 Chron. x. 9: "And they stripped him and took his head and his armor and sent . . . . ." Here it reads: **And they cut off his head and stripped off his armor.**—The **And they sent** is not to be connected with the "to publish it" (Then.), as if the Philistines had "beforehand" published the victory around, meantime retaining Saul's head and armor, in order to carry them in

* [See "Text. and Grammat."—Tr.]

* [See "Text. and Gramm." where Erdmann's translation: "on the side of the plain and on the side of Jordan" is accepted as conveying the sense. But the ordinary rendering "beyond Jordan" may be retained (as in Eng. A. V.) by supposing that the panic was so great as to extend to the other side of the river, and that the Philistines temporarily occupied the transjordanic cities. Similarly the people "beyond the plain" were panic-struck and fled.—Tr.]

triumph on their return, but according to the contrast we must supply "head and armor," which they sent around **to announce the good news to their idol-temples**—that is, to the priests serving in the temples—**and to the people.**—Saul's head and armor were the signs of victory for priests and people. Instead of "idol-temples"* Chron. and Sept. have "idols" in accordance with the idea that the power of their idols was manifested in this victory.—Ver. 10. The Ashtaroth-houses† are identical with these idol-temples. Instead of "Ashtaroth" Chron. has "their gods" [the general for the particular—Tr.]. **And they fastened his body to the wall of Bethshan.**—The Chronicler has: "And they fastened his head on the temple of Dagon;" that is, he omits the statement about the corpse and adds this about the head. According to ver. 12 the Philistines act in the same way with the corpses of Saul's sons. Our narrator, being occupied from this point of view chiefly with Saul's fate, was concerned to relate first what was done with Saul's body. As Bethshan (the present Beisan, Rob. III., I., 408 [Am. ed. II. 320, 328, 354; III. 326–332]), according to this, was in the hands of the Philistines (so ver. 7), they held the country as far as the Jordan [Bethshan is four miles west of the Jordan and twelve miles south of the sea of Galilee—Tr.]. The corpses were fastened on without the heads, the latter, with the armor, being fixed on the temples as trophies of victory.

Vers. 11–13. *The interment of the corpses* by the inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead.

Ver. 11. When the Jabeshites heard what the Philistines had done to Saul, they thought of what Saul had once done for them (ch. xi.)—[Bib. Com.: a touching and rare example of national gratitude.—Tr.]—Ver. 12. **They went the whole night and took** (under cover of darkness) **the corpses from the wall and brought them to Jabesh-Gilead and burnt them.**—The bodies were burned (a practice peculiar to heathendom, allowed in Israel only in the case of the worst criminals, Lev. xx.)‡ instead of being buried, as was usual, not because the Jabeshites feared further insult to the corpses if the Philistines should take their city (Then. [Philipps.]), but probably because their mutilation rendered them unfit for ordinary burial. The *Chaldee*, in contradiction with the text, understands the "burning" to refer to the solemn burning of spices, which was afterwards customary at the burial of kings.—Ver. 13. **They took their bones and buried them**; only the flesh, therefore, was burned, perhaps because it had already putrefied. They buried the bones **under the tamarisk at Jabesh**; the Chronicler: "under the *oak* at Jabesh." The Art. indicates a well-known tree. The Chronicler, omitting the "night-march," does not mention the taking of the bodies from the wall, as he had not mentioned their being fastened there, and also omits the burning of the corpses "because it was contrary to the prevailing custom" (Then.), not because he could not reconcile it with the burial of the bones (Keil). With grateful remembrance of Saul's rescue of Jabesh, a public mourning with a seven days' fast was made for him. David afterwards caused the bones to be interred in Saul's family burial place at Zelah in Benjamin (2 Sam. xxi. 11–14).

* The sing. בית with a plu. subst. in plu. sense as in Ex. vi. 14.

† [This is thought by the *Bib. Comm.* to be the famous temple of Venus at Askelon.—Tr.]

‡ [Other supposed cases of burning of corpses are Amos vi. 10; 2 Chr. xvi. 14; Jer. xxxiv. 5, of which the two last, however, refer to spice-burnings, and the first may be rendered "his uncle and his kinsman," or the cremation may express the extreme suffering and religious declension of the nation.—Tr.]

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The deepest and the real ground of Saul's last dark act of self-destruction is not the extremity of the moment nor fear of insult from the enemy (Wuttcke, *Eth.* II. 171), though his words make this the immediate occasion of his suicide, but the *decay* of his inner life, which we have traced step by step, through unchecked *self-will* and unbending pride towards the living God, and through the complete severance of his *heart* from God. The straitened and disgraceful position to which the Philistines had brought him, whence there was no escape with life, was the result of his persistent, stubborn disobedience to God, and of the inward judicial infliction of self-hardening. As self-willed lord of his life, unbending, haughty controller of his fate over against God, he will put an end to his life; this is the end of the insoluble contradiction in which he had placed himself towards the holy and just God; this is the act of completed despair, in which God's judgment is exhausted, and he himself must be its instrument.

2. In consequence of Saul's misgovernment and his last unfortunate war with the Philistines, the kingdom of Israel had become disorganized. The latter part of his reign was a time of disintegration of the people, which had lost its proper unity under the theocratic king, and fallen into a disorganized condition like that of the Period of the Judges. A glimpse into this state of confusion is given us not merely by the indication in the First Book of Samuel of the support that David found during his persecution by Saul, but also by the additional statements in First Chronicles of the adhesion of fighting men to him and his cause. 1) 1 Chron. xii. 8–18 mentions not merely men of *Judah*, but also *Gadites* and *Benjaminites*, who came to him in the wilderness of Judah, comp. 1 Sam. xxii.–xxiv. 2) 1 Chron. xii. 1–7 relates the coming of the brave *Benjamites* while David was in Ziklag, 1 Sam. xxvii. 1–7. 3) 1 Chron. xii. 19–22 tells of the *Manassites* who joined him after his return to Ziklag before Saul's last battle with the Philistines, 1 Sam. xxix. 3 sq. Thus David had an army in Ziklag (comp. 1 Chron. xii. 21), composed of fighting men from various tribes, who had gradually gathered around him, with which he was able immediately after Saul's death to establish (first in Judah, in Hebron) the theocratic kingdom that had been delivered to him by divine calling and choice (comp. 2 Sam. ii. 1–11).—Ewald: "The city became in fact the foundation of David's whole kingdom."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1. Osiander: For the sake of an ungodly ruler sometimes a whole people or land is pun-

ished.—Starke: They who share the sin are justly made to share the punishment also. Even God's people do not always carry off the victory, and their sins are commonly to blame for it.—Ver. 2. Cramer: In common punishments pious people must often suffer along with the ungodly (Ezek. xxi. 3; Eccl. ix. 2). But let no one take offence at this, let him rather believe that to them that love God, even such things must work together for good (Rom. viii. 28).—[Henry: Jonathan falls with the rest. 1. God would hereby complete the judgment that was to be executed upon Saul's house. 2. He would hereby make David's way to the crown clear and open. Jonathan himself would have cheerfully resigned all his title and interest to him; but his friends would probably have been zealous for the right line of succession. 3. God would hereby show us that the difference between good and bad is to be made in the other world, not in this.—Tr.]—Tueb. Bible: God bears long with sinners, especially the revengeful; but at last His judgments break in so that they can no longer be kept back.—Ver. 3. Berl. Bib.: Saul's death is a mournful picture of the dreadful death of a soul that forsakes the tranquillity and the way of God, in which through the goodness of God it had been led, and falls from one sin into another.—From what the Scriptures relate of Saul it can be seen how in souls that have swerved from the right path one sin is wont always to follow upon another.—Ver. 4. Hedinger [from Hall]: Wicked men care more for the shame of the world than the danger of their souls (Judg. ix. 54).—Schlier: So ends the man who formerly began well. How frightful it is to die in one's sins, to depart impenitent, to go uncalled before the judgment-seat of God! How terrible it is to have nothing to show but a wasted time of grace!—[Hall: Evil examples, especially of the great, never escaped imitation; the armor-bearer of Saul follows his master, and dares do that to himself which to his king he durst not.—Tr.]—Ver. 6. Cramer: When God's wrath blazes out, there is no ceasing. And it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God (Heb. x. 31).—S. Schmid: The judgments of God, which befall the pious and the ungodly alike, are rather to be wondered at than curiously investigated.—Schlier: A fearful end is only the conclusion of a foregoing life; sin begins little and invisible, hardening goes on step by step. Sin is a frightful power: first man commits sin, and when he has long continued to commit it, he is at length unable to cease from it, and the end is that he no longer wishes to cease from it. Think of Saul's end and learn in time to be wise.—Ver. 7. Berl. Bib.: So finely has Saul presided over the kingdom of Israel through his perverse ways, that even so many cities have been lost. O how there does arise even in temporal things nothing but injury through perverse ways, especially those of the shepherds and leaders of the people!—Starke: When God designs to punish His people, He takes away their courage, so that even at a rustling leaf they fear and flee (Lev. xxvi. 36).—Cramer: No one sits too high for God; He can easily cast down even the mighty to the ground (Luke i. 52; Ezek. xxi. 6; Sir. x. 5).—[Vers. 9, 10. Henry: Thus did they ascribe the honor of their victory, not, as they ought to have done, to the real justice of the true God, but to the imaginary power of their false gods; and by this respect paid to pretended deities, shame those who give not the praise of their achievements to the living God.—Tr.]

[Ver. 4. *Suicide, as illustrated by the case of Saul:* I. Causes: 1) Not merely accumulated misfortunes, but long-continued wrong-doing; 2) Cowardly fear of suffering (ver. 3), even in a man formerly brave; 3) Caring more for disgrace than for sin; 4) Abandonment of trust in God, as to this life and the future life. II. Effects: 1) Others led by the example into the same folly and sin (ver. 5); 2) Personal dishonor not really prevented (vers. 4, 9, 10); 3) A crowning and lasting reproach to the man's memory.

[Vers. 11-13. *The exploit of the men of Jabesh-Gilead:* 1) It was a brave deed; 2) A patriotic deed; 3) A grateful deed (chap. xi.); 4) But the bravery, patriotism and gratitude had been better shown before Saul's death by helping him (which they do not appear to have done). Honors after death make poor amends for neglect and unfaithfulness during life; 5) And care of the poor remains could avail little for the man's reputation in this world, and nothing for his repose in eternity.—Tr.]

THE

SECOND BOOK OF SAMUEL.

THE

SECOND BOOK OF SAMUEL.

THIRD PART. DAVID.

2 SAMUEL.

FIRST DIVISION: DAVID'S RULE OVER JUDAH ALONE TILL HE BECOMES KING OVER ALL ISRAEL.

CHAPTERS I.—V. 5.

FIRST SECTION.

David after Saul's Death.

CHAP. I. 1–25.

1. *The News of the Death.* Vers. 1–16.

1 Now [And] it came to pass[1] after the death of Saul, when David was returned
from the slaughter of the Amalekites,[2] and David had abode [that David abode]
two days in Ziklag [in Ziklag two days]. It came even [And it came] to pass on
the third day that, behold, a man came out of [from] the camp from[3] Saul with
his clothes[4] rent and earth upon his head; and *so* it was [*om.* so it was] when he
3 came to David, that [*om.* that] he fell to the earth and did obeisance. And David
said unto him, From whence comest[5] thou? And he said unto him, Out of [From]
the camp of Israel am I escaped. And David said unto him, How went the[6] matter?

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. Cahen and Wordsworth regard this phrase as connecting the Second Book with the first; but it seems to be nothing more than the ordinary formula of historical narrative, referring to 1 Sam. xxxi. So begins ch. ii. of 2 Sam. There is no trace here of a division of "Samuel" into two Books.—TR.]

[2] [Ver. 1. Some MSS. and EDD. read הָעֲמָלֵקִי, the usual form. Whether the present Heb. text (with the Art.) is impossible (Wellh.) may be considered doubtful. A final Yod may, however, have fallen out from similarity to the following Waw.—TR.]

[3] [Ver. 2. Thenius thinks that the Sept. reading: "from the people of (מֵעַם) Saul" suits the connection as well as the Heb.; against which Wellhausen remarks that the Greek reading contradicts ver. 6, from which it appears that the Amalekite did not belong to the army. This reason of Wellh. does not seem decisive (for in ver. 3 he seems to say, that he had been in the army); but the Heb. phrase is more natural than the Greek.—TR.]

[4] [Ver. 2. בְּגָדָיו, the word for civilian dress, not military vestment (מַד) as in 1 Sam. iv. 12; Judg. iii. 16 (*Bib. Com.*). This would so far make against the supposition that he was a soldier.—TR.]

[5] [Ver. 3. The Impf. (תָּבוֹא) may represent the action as incomplete,—whence art thou now engaged in coming?—TR.]

[6] [Ver. 4. Sept.: What is this affair? that is, What is the matter?—מַה־זֶּה הַדָּבָר (Wellh.), which is not as good as the Heb. text. Syr.: "what is the affair?"—TR.]

4 I pray thee, tell me. And he answered [said], That [*om.* that][7] the people are fled
from the battle, and many of the people also[8] are fallen and dead, and Saul and
5 Jonathan his son are dead also.[8] And David said unto the young man that told
6 him, How knowest thou that Saul and Jonathan his son be dead[9]? And the young
man that told him said, As [*om.* as] I happened by chance upon Mount Gilboa,
[*ins.* and] behold, Saul leaned upon his spear, and lo, the chariots and [*ins.* the]
7 horsemen[10] followed hard after him. And when [*om.* when] he looked behind him
[*or* turned round], he [and] saw me, and called unto me. And I answered [said],
8 Here am I. And he said unto me, Who art thou? And I answered [said to]
9 him, I am an Amalekite. He [And he] said unto me again [*om.* again], Stand I
pray thee, upon[11] me, and slay me, for anguish is come upon me [the cramp[12] hath
10 seized on me], because [for] my life is yet whole in me. So [And] I stood upon
him and slew him, because I was sure that he could not live after that he was
fallen; and I took the crown [diadem[13]] that was upon his head and the bracelet
11 that was on his arm, and have brought them hither unto my lord. Then David
took hold on his clothes and rent them, and likewise all the men that were with
12 him; And they mourned and wept and fasted until [*ins.* the] even for Saul and
for Jonathan his son and for the people of the Lord [Jehovah[14]] and for the house
13 of Israel, because they were fallen by the sword. And David said unto the young
man that told him, Whence art thou? And he answered [said], I am the son of a
14 stranger,[15] an Amalekite. And David said unto him, How wast thou not afraid to
15 stretch forth thine hand to destroy the Lord's [Jehovah's] anointed? And David
called one of the young men, and said, Go near *and* fall upon him [Approach,
16 fall on him]. And he smote him that he died. And David said unto him,
Thy blood[16] be upon thy head, for thy mouth hath testified against thee, saying,
I have slain the Lord's [Jehovah's] anointed.

[7] [Ver. 4. The אֲשֶׁר here = ὅτι, introducing a remark as *oratio indirecta* (Then. and Erdmann: = "namely"), and we might render: and he said, that the people were fled and . . . fallen, *etc.* (so Philippson); but "that" with *orat. directa* (as in Eng. A. V.) is not Eng. idiom.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 4. This "also . . . also" is not a very good rendering of the Heb. גַּם . . . גַּם, since it does not clearly bring out the collocation and climax in the two clauses. On the other hand Erdmann's rendering: "not only are many of the people dead, but also Saul and Jonathan are dead," makes a sharper contrast than the Heb. expresses. Perhaps the sense would be more exactly given by translating: "the people fled, and moreover many are dead, and moreover Saul," *etc.*—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 5. Lit.: that Saul is dead, and Jonathan his son? The Syr. has: "David said to the young man, Tell me how died Saul and Jonathan his son?" a reading which seems to have nothing for it. The repetition of the descriptive phrase: "that told him" = "his informant," is in accordance with the ancient manner of writing; compare the standing epithets of the Homeric gods and heroes.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 6. Lit.: "possessors of horses," where the last word (פָּרָשׁ) is the charger or war-horse as distinguished from the ordinary horse (סוּס). The Chald. translates the first word (בַּעֲלֵי) "army," which is a loose and inaccurate rendering. [Wellhausen, regarding the Heb. phrase as a strange one, has an ingenious supposition that there was originally to this פָּרָשִׁים of the text a correction בַּעֲלֵי קֶשֶׁת, "possessors of bows," of which the first word got into the text here, and the second (קֶשֶׁת) into ver. 18, to the vexation of interpreters. Our phrase, though it occurs here only, is perhaps possible, but the בעלי is probably an early insertion. —Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 9. עֲמָד עַל. Instead of "stand upon" = "stand against," some (Gesen., Philippson, Cahen, Erdmann) render "stand by," = "come near, approach." The objection to this latter rendering is that the verb means always "stand" or "make a stand," as in the passages cited by Cahen, Dan. xii. 1, Michael stands by (on behalf of) the people, Esth. viii. 11, the Jews make a stand for their lives. Here we should expect a verb of motion: "come near and slay me," as in Jer. vii. 10; xvii. 9. It is better, therefore, to adopt the sense of rising up, standing against, or to use the phrase "stand on" made familiar by the English Authorised Version. —Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 9. So Aq. (ὁ σφιγκτήρ) and probably Syr. (צוּרנָא, rendered badly in Walton's Polyg. *caligines.* Castellus gives *vertigo*, and J. D. Michaelis *spasmus*), and so most moderns. See Gesenius, *Thesaur. s. v.*—The last clause of the verse is literally: "for all yet is my life in me," which is given by Saul as the reason why the young man should slay him.—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 10. So Sym. and Theod. Aquila has ἀφόρισμα from the ground-meaning of the stem נזר, "to set apart," perhaps regarding the diadem as that which especially characterizes and sets apart a king (Schleusner).—Wellh. thinks that the Art. is necessary to אֶצְעָדָה.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 12. Sept.: "for the people of Judah and for the house of Israel," the other VSS. as the Heb. Wellh. thinks "people of Judah" the true text-reading, but supposes that this may be a corruption of "people of Jahveh," and that it called forth the addition "house of Israel." But, on the other hand, the Sept. reading looks like an attempt to smooth away a supposed difficulty, and the Heb. text gives a clear and deeply theocratic sense, which is well brought out by Then. and Erdmann. The Synopsis Criticorum and Wellh. are wrong in saying that "people of Jahveh" and "house of Israel" are identical expressions.—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 13. Or: "an Amalekite stranger." Aq. προσηλύτου, and so Gill.—Tr.]

[16] [Ver. 16. The text has the Plu., the Sing. is found in many MSS. (De Rossi) and in Qeri, apparently as if the Plu. alone meant "blood-guiltiness." But in the Heb. of O. T. both Sing. and Plu. are used in both senses, of "blood" and of "blood-guiltiness," see Lev. xvii. 4 for the latter sense in the Sing. The Sing. in the VSS. decides

2. *David's Elegy*. Vers. 17–27.

17 And David lamented with this lamentation over Saul and over Jonathan his
18 son, (Also he bade them teach the children of Judah *The use of* the bow;[17] behold,
it is written in the book of Jasher.) [*Om.* parenthesis-sign, *render:* And he commanded that the children of Judah should be taught *this song of* "The Bow;" behold, *etc.*:]

19 The beauty[18] of Israel is slain upon thy high places [heights]!
How are the mighty fallen!
20 Tell it not in Gath,
Publish it not in the streets of Askelon,
Lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice,
Lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph.
21 Ye mountains of Gilboa, *let there be* no dew, neither *let there be* rain upon you [be neither dew nor rain on you],
Nor fields of offerings;
For there the shield of the mighty is vilely cast away,[19]
[For there was cast away the shield of the heroes],
The shield of Saul *as though he had* not *been* anointed [unanointed][20] with oil.
22 From the blood of the slain,
From the fat[21] of the mighty [of heroes]
The bow of Jonathan turned not back,
And the sword of Saul returned not empty.
23 Saul and Jonathan *were* lovely and pleasant[22] in their lives,
And in their death they were not divided.
They were swifter than eagles!
They were stronger than lions!
24 Ye daughters of Israel, weep over[23] Saul,
Who clothed you in scarlet with *other* delights,
Who put on ornaments of gold upon your apparel.
25 How are the mighty fallen in the midst of the battle!
O Jonathan, thou *wast* slain in thine high places [on thy heights].[24]
I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan.

nothing for the Heb. text, because elsewhere (as Gen. iv. 10) the Heb. Plu. — "blood" is given by the Sing. in Syr. and Chald. Wellh. thinks that this Qeri may have been determined by the use in 1 Kings ii. 33, 37.—After "saying" Sept. has ὅτι of *orat. indirecta* as in ver. 4, and De Rossi mentions that one MS. in his possession here has כִּי, which is perhaps a copyist's imitation of later usage.—Tr.]

[17] [Ver. 18. So Targ., Rashi and Gill. The discussion in the Exposition.—Tr.]

[18] [Ver. 19. Some take the הַ as Interrog., and render: Is the beauty of Israel slain? *etc.*; but the interrogative form does not so well suit the connection. Others regard "Israel" as Vocative, on account of the following "thy," which otherwise would have no antecedent; against this (otherwise most natural) rendering is, as Erdmann remarks, the hardness of the first word: The beauty, O Israel, is slain, *etc.* *Bib. Com.* therefore translates: Thy beauty, O Israel; but it is questionable whether the "thy" can lawfully be supplied. The rendering: "O beauty of Israel slain,' *etc.*, is harsh, because we should expect "thou art slain." Perhaps the second of the above translations is the preferable.—Tr.]

[19] [Ver. 21. Erdmann and others render "defiled," against which see Ges., *Thes. s. v.*—Tr.]

[20] [Ver. 21. The Chald., and perhaps Syr., refers the anointing to Saul instead of to his shield. Eng. A. V. follows Vulg., which is undoubtedly wrong.—In some MSS. and printed EDD. מָשׁוּחַ is written instead of מָשִׁיחַ, and this is the more usual form; but in this poetical passage the less usual form is not unnatural. Instead of בְּלִי, "not," some MSS. have כְּלִי — "implement:" "the shield of Saul, armor anointed with oil," an improbable and unsupported reading.—Tr.]

[21] [Ver. 22. The reading חֶרֶב, "sword," found in some MSS., is perhaps a mere textual error (found in no VS.), or perhaps a correction for dignity.—Tr.]

[22] [Ver. 23. These Adjectives have the Art. in the Heb., whence Then. and Erdmann render: "Saul and Jonathan, the lovely and pleasant, in life and in death they were not divided." Eng. A. V. is supported by all the ancient VSS. and by most modern commentators.—Tr.]

[23] [Ver. 24. עַל instead of אֶל in some MSS.; but the change is unnecessary since אֶל — "in respect to, for."—In מַלְבִּשְׁכֶם some codices substitute the fem. suffix כֶן, as in the last word of the verse; it is probable, however, that the masc. form was used (especially in poetry) for both genders.—Tr.]

[24] [Ver. 25. Coislin.: εἰς θάνατον ἐτραυματίσθης, "thou wast wounded unto death," a weak reading in comparison with the Heb. text.—Tr.]

Very pleasant hast thou been unto me,
Thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women.
How are the mighty fallen,
And the weapons of war perished!

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

I. Vers. 1–16. *The news of Saul's death, and David's reception of it.*

Ver. 1 sq. This narrative is closely connected with that of David's return to Ziklag and Saul's death in chaps. xxx. and xxxi. of the First Book. The words: "and it came to pass after the death of Saul," attach themselves immediately to 1 Sam. xxxi., thus continuing the narrative after the account there given of his death. The words: "and David was returned from the slaughter of the Amalekites," resume the narrative in ch. xxx., and connect themselves especially with vers. 17, 26.—The grammatical apodosis begins with "and abode" (וַיֵּשֶׁב), though according to the sense and the connection ver. 2 forms the *factual* apodosis. The narrator desires to make an exact chronological statement for the following account, to bring out prominently that the news of Saul's death was closely connected with the events related in chs. xxx., xxxi. The precise statement that "after David had stayed *two days* in Ziklag, the messenger came on *the third day* with the news of Saul's death," indicates, on the one hand, that the narrative is drawn from exact, minute original sources, and, on the other, that David's return from the battle with the Amalekites happened about the same time as the battle of Gilboa.

Ver. 2. **And behold, a man came**, according to ver. 6 a youth; he had belonged to the Israelitish army as a combatant.—[See the doubt as to this fact in "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]—"From with Saul" (מֵעִם) = "from the neighborhood of Saul," comp. vers. 3, 4. The *rent garment* and the *earth on the head* are signs of grief. See 1 Sam. iv. 12. His "falling down" recognizes David as future king. See xiv. 4; xix. 18; 1 Kings xviii. 7.

Ver. 3. "Escaped," as all the people had fled from the battle, according to ver. 4.

Ver. 4. *David's question:* "How was the affair, that happened?" is at the same time the expression of dismay at the news of the flight. The *answer* is introduced by a Conj. (אֲשֶׁר, Eng. A. V. "that"), here = our "namely;" comp. iv. 10; 1 Sam. xv. 20 (כִּי is sometimes used). *Three statements* follow one on another in the rapid, curt account of the informant, who, in keeping with David's word "tell me," is repeatedly termed "the young man that told him," vers. 5, 6, 13: 1) "The people are fled from the battle," the whole army broken up in flight; 2) "Many of the people are fallen and dead."* This is not in opposition with 1 Sam. xxxi. 6: "and all his men," because the latter refers to the men immediately around Saul; 3) "And also Saul and Jonathan his son are dead." We may render: "not only many of the people, . . . but also Saul and Jonathan are dead." The climax in the three statements is obvious. To David's question (ver. 5), which refers only to the last statement respecting Saul and Jonathan, the messenger replies (vers. 6–10) with a full account of Saul's death.

Ver. 6. **I happened by chance**, that is, in the press of battle, and in the flight, which took the direction towards Mount Gilboa, see 1 Sam. xxxi. 1.—**Behold, Saul leaned on his spear.** This does not mean (Bunsen) that Saul was lying on the ground, "propping his weary head with the nervously-clutched spear;" no support for this view is found in vers. 9, 10, for the "after he was fallen" in ver. 10 does not refer to his fall to the ground. Nor is it to be understood (Cler. and others) of the attempt to kill himself (according to 1 Sam. xxxi. 4). We must rather suppose that Saul was leaning on his spear (which was fixed in the earth, 1 Sam. xxvi. 7) in order to hold himself up, being perfectly exhausted. While he was standing there, "lo, the chariots (that is, the chariot-warriors) and the horsemen followed hard on him," came so near that they must soon have reached him, see Judg. xx. 42. Death or captivity stared him in the face. It is not probable that "chariots and horsemen" followed the flying Israelites on the *mountains;* according to 1 Sam. xxxi. 4 the pursuers were the archers. Cler. justly: "This seems to be the beginning of the young man's falsehoods."

Ver. 7. **And he turned round**, which could not be said of him, if he had been lying on the ground.*—Ver. 8. The marginal reading "I said" [so Eng. A. V.] is to be preferred to the text "he said," which seems to have come from the "he said" in the beginning of the following verse (Then.).—[Some take the Heb. 3 pers. to be *oratio obliqua;* but this is not probable.—Tr.]—Ver. 9. **For the cramp has seized me.** So we must render this subst., "cramp" as a twisting of the body (from a stem meaning "to weave, interwork, work together"), not "death-agony" (Vulg.), not the "cuirass" or other part of the armor (S. Schmid), nor "vertigo or fainting" (Gesen., De Wette), to which the following: "all my life is yet in me" does not suit. In consequence of his excitements and exertions, Saul found himself in a bodily condition in which he could not defend himself against the onpressing enemy. The "because" (the second כִּי) gives a further reason for the request to slay him, since Saul feared that in his defenceless condition he would suffer the indignity of falling alive into the Philistines' hands.†—[*Paraphrase* of ver. 9:

* On the adverb. use of the Inf. Abs. (הַרְבֵּה) see Ew., § 280 *a*.—On גַּם . . . גַּם see 1 Sam. xvii. 36 and Ew. § 359, 1.

* [The Heb. (וַיִּפֶן) means "turned his face, looked round," which seems possible for a man lying on the ground, half-raised on a spear.—Tr.]

† This insertion of עוֹד between כָּל as *nomen regens* and the *nomen rectum* occurs in a few other cases, Job xxvii. 3. See Ges., § 114, 3 R. 1.

Kill me, for the enemy will soon be on me, I am too badly wounded to defend myself, yet, not being mortally wounded, I shall be taken alive. —TR.]—Ver. 10. The Amalekite says, that he slew Saul in accordance with his request, because he saw he "would not live after his fall," could not survive his fall. The "fall"* does not mean "apostasy from God" (O. v. Gerlach), for, apart from the impossibility of the Amalekite's using such an expression, we should expect some corresponding additional phrase; nor "falling after a severe, but not mortal wound," inflicted by himself (Cler., Schmid *et al.*), for this view presupposes a wrong conception of the "leaning on his spear," the account in 1 Sam. xxxi. 4 being mixed up with this account. The "fall" here means "defeat;" see Prov. xxiv. 16.—He took from his head his golden *diadem* (not "crown," נֵזֶר), the emblem of the royal dignity. The "bracelet or arm-band" was worn not only by women, but also by men, see Num. xxxi. 50. So the army-commanders are adorned on the Assyrian monuments (Layard's *Nineveh*), and the *kings* on the Egyptian. The Amalekite brings from Saul's corpse the symbols of the royal dignity in order to confirm his words, and thus secure the favor of David, whom he looked on as king, and gain a rich reward.—The narrative of the Amalekite contradicts 1 Sam. xxxi. 3, where Saul kills himself with his own sword. The explanation of this difference by the assumption of two different original accounts of Saul's death (Gramberg, *Religionsid.* II. 89, and Ewald) is totally baseless (Then.). Winer (*R.-W.* II. 392): "In any other than a biblical writer, this difference would certainly not be regarded as proof of the composition of the Book from two narrations." Equally untenable is the attempt at harmonizing the two (Joseph., *Ant.* 6, 14, 7, some Rabbis, and especially S. Schmid) by saying that Saul had only wounded himself severely by falling on his sword, and received the death-stroke from the Amalekite; this contradicts the statement in 1 Sam. xxxi. 1.—A careful comparison of the Amalekite's account with the other shows that, although his statement about Israel's defeat and the enemy's pressing on Saul was true, he lied in saying that he killed Saul, in order to gain favor and a royal reward from David; so Theod., Brenz, Calov., Serar., Sankt., Cler., Mich., Winer, Then., Keil.—[A. Clarke, Kitto, *Bib. Com.*, Philippson reject the Amalekite's story as a fabrication; Patrick and Gill seem to think it in general true, though distorted here and there; Wordsworth defends it (appealing to Josephus), taking it to be supplementary to the other—if it were not true, he asks, why did the Amalekite not deny it, when he saw that he was to be put to death for it? To this it may be replied, that no time was given him, or perhaps he did deny it, and his denial was disregarded. As for the diadem and bracelet, he might easily have picked them up before the Philistines came to strip the slain. His account of Saul's death cannot well be harmonized with that of 1 Sam. xxxi., and then he had an obvious motive for his story. —TR.]

Ver. 11 sq. "Weeping and mourning aloud" and rending the garments on the breast were signs of grief and sorrow for the dead. See Gen. xxxvii. 34, 35; l. 1; 2 Sam. iii. 32, 34; Judg. xi. 35.—The whole body of soldiers took part in David's deep grief. The Sept. adds at the end: "rent their clothes" as explanatory of the terse Heb. text. The numerous signs of sorrow here mentioned, rending the garments, mourning, weeping, fasting ("till evening") exhibit the greatness of David's sincere grief. The order of mention of the objects of the lamentation is the inverse of that in ver. 4: Saul, Jonathan, the people. His grief for *Saul* shows his heart to be free from bitterness, revenge and malignant joy; he mourns the fall of the *anointed* of the Lord. His heart must have been filled with deep sorrow for the death of Jonathan, whom he had not seen since the incident recorded in 1 Sam. xxiii. 18. He laments over the slain and scattered *people* for the misery and ignominy that had befallen them through defeat by the uncircumcised heathen. He calls them "*the people of the Lord*" with special reference to their position as a people chosen by the Lord from all nations, thus His special property by a holy covenant, whose wars against foreign nations, out of whom he had separated them, are *the Lord's wars*, comp. 1 Sam. xxv. 28. The *house of Israel* denotes the people as a unit, with reference to their common descent. The people of *the Lord* was in this battle abandoned by the Lord; the *house* of Israel as a whole and in all its parts was cast down.—[On the alleged difficulty in the text of the latter part of this verse see "Text. and Gram."—TR.]

Ver. 13 sq. To David's question concerning his origin the young man answers that "he is the son of an Amalekite *stranger*," that is, of an Amalekite who had settled in Israel.*—Ver. 14. From the same reverence for the sacred life of Saul that he showed before in the words: "I will not lay my hand on my lord, for he is the Lord's anointed" (1 Sam. xxiv. 11), springs David's indignant question to the Amalekite: **How wast thou not afraid to stretch forth thy hand against the Lord's anointed?**—Comp. 1 Sam. xxxi. 4 where the armor-bearer "fears" to do such a thing. This question supposes that the young man, as a foreigner at home in Israel and living under its law, might very well know what a crime he committed in laying his hand on the king's person, even at the king's request. The question shows beyond doubt that David took his account to be true, and his indignation at the crime shows how far he was from any sort of revenge against the (in his eyes) sacred person of Saul.—Ver. 15. David causes the Amalekite to be straightway slain for his self-avowed crime. He slays him not merely that, after the Amalekite has confessed the regicide, he (David) may not be supposed to countenance such a crime, and especially not Saul's murder (Thenius), but he punishes him for his crime against the person of the anointed of the Lord, and that on the ground of his right as the king now chosen and appointed by the Lord. It was a *theocratic*, not a *political* act, as Clericus thinks ("it is to be attributed to political reasons"), and so Thenius and other moderns.—Ver. 16. While

* On the irreg. form (נָפְלוֹ) see Ew., § 255 *d*.

* [For Jewish traditions and fables on this whole history see Patrick, Gill, Philippson.—TR.]

the preparations for the execution of the judgment are going on, David pronounces the formal *sentence* of capital punishment: **Thy blood* be on thy head.**—"Thou hast brought this bloody punishment on thyself, having confessed thy crime."—**For thy mouth hath testified against thee.**—The ground of the sentence of death was the statement of the Amalekite himself; he affirmed that the ornaments he brought were taken from the body of Saul, designing thus to prove that Saul had been killed by his hand, and hoping to receive a rich reward. See ch. iv. 10.—Theodoret remarks that it was becoming that the "Prophet and King" should be astonished at this deed, but not blame it.—[It was so obvious and dreadful a crime that he could only express astonishment at it.—Tr.]—What David himself with holy horror had refused to do, namely, to lay hands on Saul's sacred person, this murderer (so it seemed to him) had done.—[The Commentators refer to the fact that the law requiring two witnesses in a death-sentence was here set aside from the peculiarity of the circumstances. There is no trace of special anger and haste because of the nationality of the supposed regicide; but the execution may without difficulty be regarded as having a political character—not that David, looking to his own accession to the throne, wished to ward off such attempts against himself, or to curry favor with Saul's friends, but that, regarding himself as in fact the highest political authority in the land, he dispensed punishment for a notorious and shocking political crime. It can hardly be suspected (Philippson) from the words: "thy mouth hath witnessed against thee," that "David saw through the Amalekite." Against the allegation that David's conduct here was hypocritical, Chandler cites the cases of Alexander weeping over Darius, Scipio over Carthage, Cæsar over Pompey, and Augustus over Antony.—Tr.]

II. *David's elegy*. Vers. 17–27.

Ver. 17. **And David sang this lament.**—That David was the author of this elegy is proved by this history, as well as by the vigor of the song and its harmony with David's situation and feeling. For the general defeat of Israel David and his men expressed their sorrow as is above related. Here follows the voice of mourning from David's heart especially over Saul and Jonathan, the deaths of both of whom must powerfully have moved him, though for different reasons.

Ver. 18. Two notices are prefixed to the Song: one as to its *destination;* the other as to its *source*. As respects its *destination* it is said: "and he said (commanded) to teach it to the children of Judah," they were to learn and practice it (comp. Deut. xxxi. 19; Ps. lx. 1), probably that they might sing it in their military practice with the bow (Grot., Delitzsch in *Herz.* XII. 280). For קֶשֶׁת is best understood (from ver. 22) as the title: Song of the Bow.—[Eng. A. V. improperly supplies: "the use of."—Tr.]—With all its notes of sorrow the whole Song has a warlike ground-tone, celebrating Saul and Jonathan as warriors, and "the bow was a principal weapon of the times, and used especially by Saul's tribesmen, the Benjaminites, with great success, see 1 Chron. viii. 40; xii. 2; 2 Chron. xiv. 7; xvii. 17" (Keil). Böttcher connects "bow" with "children of Judah" and renders: "to teach the archers of Judah;" but against this restriction to Judah, Thenius rightly remarks that David's purpose doubtless was that the whole people should preserve a faithful remembrance of Saul and Jonathan. Instead of "bow" (קֶשֶׁת). Then. and Ew. substitute adverbial accusatives, the former "*heedfully*" (קַשֻּׁב, Isa. xxi. 7), the latter "*exactly*" (קשׁט). Against this see the admirable remarks of Böttcher.—[Böttcher points out that Thenius' "heedfully" applies to hearing, and does not suit here, and that Ewald's conjectured word means "truth," not "correctness," and further requires (if he write קשׁת) the substitution of the late Aramaic ת (in this word) for the Heb. ט. To regarding "Bow" as the title of the Song Böttcher objects that this ought in that case to be its first word; or, if the mention of the bow in ver. 22 justifies this title (as the second Sura of the Koran is called "The Cow" from the incidental story of Moses' cow in it), the word should at least have the Art., and we should indeed expect "the song of the bow." On the other hand we may refer to such titles as those of Ps. xxii., lvi., xlv., lx. (Kitto). A new suggestion is made by *Bib. Com.*, that there was in the Book of Jashar a collection of poems, in which special mention was made of the bow (2 Sam. i. 19–27; 1 Sam. ii. 1–10; Num. xxi. 27–30; Lam. ii.; Lam. iii.; Gen. xlix.; Deut. xxxii.; perhaps Deut. xxxiii., *etc.*), that this collection was known as *Kasheth* (the bow), and that the author of 2 Sam. transferred this dirge from the Book of Jashar to his own pages with its title as follows: "*For the children of Israel to learn by heart. Kasheth from the Book of Jashar;*" the "and he said" must then be regarded as introducing the Song, the title being a parenthesis. The objection to this rendering is the position of the "and he said," which it is hard to attach to the dirge, and the way in which the Book of Jashar is referred to, which does not suit a title like those in the Psalms.—So far no satisfactory translation has been given from the existing text, nor any satisfactory emendation suggested. The rendering of Erdmann is adopted as offering the fewest difficulties.—Tr.]—The *source* whence the author drew this Song was "*the Book of the Upright*" (Sing.), or if the subst. (Jashar) be taken as collective, *of the upright ones* (Vulg. *liber justorum*). Comp. Josh. x. 13. It was in existence before the Books of Joshua and Samuel, and contained (judging from the two extracts here and in Joshua) a collection of Songs on specially remarkable events of the Israelite history, together with celebration of the prominent pious men, whose names were connected with these events (see Bleek, *Introd.*); Maurer: "songs in praise of worthy Israelites."—[On the Book of Jashar or The Upright, the various opinions as to its origin and character (including Donaldson's fanciful and unsound book), the two Rabbinical works of this name, the anonymous work

* Read the Plu. of דָּם as in the Kethib [Germ. has Qeri, wrongly], since this alone is used in the sense of "blood-guiltiness." [This is incorrect; see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

of 1625 (an English translation of which was published in New York in 1840 by M. M. Noah; it abounds in fables, and was apparently the work of a Spanish Jew), and the "clumsy forgery" which appeared in England in 1751 under the name of the "Book of Jasher" (reprinted in 1827 and in 1833)—see Art. "Book of Jasher" in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, and Gill's *Commentary in loco* and on Josh. x. 13. Patrick holds the opinion that it was a book concerning the right art of making war (Jasher=right), and quotes Victorinus Strigelius, who says that it was "an ecclesiastical history like those of Eusebius and Theodoret." The author has been surmised to be Gad or Nathan, inasmuch as no extract is given from the work later than the death of Saul. Dr. Erdmann states in the text the substance of what we know about it.—Tr.]

Ver. 19. **The glory of Israel on thy heights slain!**—This lament is the superscription of the whole song; herein David addresses "the people of the Lord, the house of Israel" (ver. 12). "Israel" cannot be taken as Vocative, "O Israel" (Buns., Keil, *et al.* [Kitto, Stanley, *Bib. Com.*]), because then the expression "the glory" would stand too isolated and undefined, especially at the beginning of the song; we must therefore suppose it to be defined by the following word.—[*Bib. Com.*, to avoid this difficulty, renders: "thy glory;" Chandler, Philippson and Cahen: "O glory of Israel," which is easier as supplying an antecedent for the "thy heights;" but perhaps less suitable in the connection, where we should not so naturally expect a mere exclamation, and where the subst. verb could not with this translation be supplied. Still it is a quite possible rendering, and deserves consideration.—Tr.]—Some render the opening word (הַצְּבִי) "Gazelle" (De Wette, *et al.* [Kitto, Stanley]), and Ewald then refers this to Jonathan, who, he says (Thenius: "a high-handed way, in truth, of dealing with *history*"), was generally known among the warriors as "the Gazelle;" but this, apart from the absence in the song of any comparison with the gazelle, or any allusion to its swiftness and agility, is untenable simply because the song speaks throughout not of *one hero* (Jonathan), but of *two* (Saul and Jonathan). As the composition has the ring of a *hero-song* in honor of these two, who were in fact the hero-glory of Israel, we must render the word "glory, ornament." The "heights," on which these the "ornament of Israel" were slain, are the mountains of Gilboa, on which David looks as the scene of the tragic end of the two greatest heroes of Israel. At the outset of his song he laments the heavy loss which Israel suffered in noble hero-power. This sorrowful lament is still more definitely expressed in the following words: "How are the heroes fallen!" *Thrice* it appears as the ground-tone of the whole song. Here at the beginning it introduces the lament for the two strong *heroes*, Saul and Jonathan (vers. 20-24), which forms the greater part of the song; in ver. 25 it is the basis for the lament over Jonathan alone, the deeply loved *friend*. At the close (ver. 27) it sounds out the third time, strengthened by a parallel exclamation, that the whole song as a hero-elegy may not merely "die away in a last sigh," but close with an exclamation aloud of deepest grief over the loss of these great heroes.

Ver. 20. The two Philistine cities Gath and Askelon, as the most prominent, are named in the language of poetry, for the whole land, which they represent (Gath very near, Askelon at a distance on the sea). The singer will not have Israel's great calamity known among the heathen [he did not know that the Philistines had possession of the bodies of Saul and his sons.—Tr.], for they are the "uncircumcised," the enemies of Jehovah and of His people. The latter's shame is already great enough in being overcome and trodden down by the uncircumcised nation; may it not be increased by Philistine songs of triumph over vanquished Israel.—**Tell it not in Gath**, so Mic. i. 10. "*The rejoicing of the daughters of the Philistines*" refers to the common oriental custom of the celebration by the women and virgins with songs and dances of the heroic deeds and triumphal return of the men (see 1 Sam. xviii. 6).—David's expression: "Tell it not," *etc.*, must be conceived and understood throughout according to its poetical significance: he wishes that Philistia may not learn of this defeat, that Israel may be spared the shame of becoming the object of the Philistines' scornful joy over victory. In fact the defeat of Israel could not possibly remain unknown; news of it had already gone through the whole land (1 Sam. xxxi. 9 sq.). It would be in contradiction with the poetical type to suppose (as Sack does) that David's words are an exhortation to the men assembled about him on Philistine soil [at Ziklag], that they themselves at least should not announce the sad news to the enemy. Nor is ver. 21 to be taken as a real imprecation against Nature (Then.), but as a poetical image.—Ver. 21. Over against the exultant *joy of victory* of Israel's enemies, which he would gladly be spared, David sets the *attitude of mourning*, in which he would behold the *mountains of Gilboa*, the scene of his heroes' death-struggle: **ye mountains in Gilboa**, poetical for the usual prose-form: "mountains of Gilboa" (ver. 6; 1 Sam. xxxi. 1), the Preposition further defining the Stat. Const. (see on this construction Ew. § 289 *b*, Ges. § 116, 1).—[Others suppose, not so well, that Gilboa is here named as a tract of country.—Tr.]—**Be there neither dew nor rain on you!**—May you lack that which makes you green and fruitful, and dispenses fresh life. Waste and desert they were to lie, that their death might present forever a picture of the dreadful end of those that were slain there, and so Nature might, as it were, mourn for them.—**And fields of first-fruits** (be not on you).* The fields from which were taken the firstlings (as best), were the most fruitful. The expression therefore means: may these places be destitute (not only of fructifying dew and rain, but also) of the products of a fruitful soil, may there be here no fruitful fields whence might be gathered offerings of first-fruits. This is a poetical elaboration of the thought expressed in the figure of the dew and rain, and is

* As שְׂדֵי is Sing. (the Plu. is שְׂדוֹת), all explanations based on the Plu. are wrong. תְּרוּמָה is used of the bringing of first-fruits, Num. xv. 19 sq.; 2 Chron. xxxi. 10 [but also of other offerings.—Tr.]

by no means "meaningless" (Then.). There is no need for changing the text, as Thenius, for example, after Theodotion would read: "ye *forests* and *mountains* of death."* Equally untenable is Böttcher's conjecture (*Aehrenlese*, p. 24, and *Neue Aehrenl*, p. 139): "on the fields of Jarmuth,"† especially as "the name of the city in question [Jarmuth] is doubtful, and its location near Gilboa arbitrary" (Then.). The translation "lofty fields" (*campi editi*, Cler., Maur.) is opposed to the usual meaning of the Heb. word (תְּרוּמוֹת), is here without special significance, and requires too much to be supplied in order to connect it with the preceding: "*and on you*, ye lofty fields," come neither dew nor rain.—**For there is defiled the shield of the heroes**, defiled with dust and blood, not "cast away" (Vulg.).—[Eng. A. V.: "vilely cast away," combining, not badly, the two shades of meaning of the word.—Tr.]—**The shield of Saul** is specially mentioned as the military emblem of the leader of the army.—**Not anointed with oil.** This is not an explanation of the words "defiled is Saul's shield," as the Vulg. has it: "the shield of Saul, as if it were not anointed with oil," nor a reference to Saul: "as if he were not anointed," 1 Sam. x. 1 sq. (J. H. Michaelis, S. Schmid, Dathe, *et al.* [Eng. A. V.]), the "as if" and the reference to the royal anointing being both wrongly introduced; but it expresses the fact that the shield is not "anointed with oil," as was usually done to the metallic shield (מָגֵן), in order to clean and polish it when it was stained with blood and defiled by dirt and rust (see the description in Isa. xxi. 5). In the individualizing poetical language the defiled and uncleansed shields denote the unfitness for war and the helplessness of the glory of Israel lying powerless in dust and blood. If the shield of Israel lack its ornament and grace, so mayst thou also, O field of slaughter, lack thine, mourn thou waste and dreary! Let Nature respond to the shame and wretchedness of the people.—Ver. 22 celebrates the bravery of the two heroes, which impelled them ever onward to victory, that thus the contrast to their sad end may come out more prominently. To Jonathan is assigned *the bow* (comp. 1 Sam. xviii. 4; xx. 20), to Saul *the sword*. They thus represent the weapon-power ("*Wehr und Waffen*"‡) of the whole people. The sword, and in a sort the arrow, drinks the *blood* and devours the *flesh*. This frequent poetical conception (ii. 26; Deut. xxxii. 42; Isai. i. 20; xxxiv. 6; Jer. ii .30; xlvi. 10) mingles in the words: **Saul's sword returned not empty** [**Jonathan's bow turned not back**]; these heroes were accustomed to gain complete victory, to overthrow and destroy all opposing power (comp. 1 Sam. xiv. 15).—Ver. 23. The singer sets forth how the two met death not only together, but also in a deep, cordial union of war-comradeship. They were "beloved" and "lovely, amiable," the latter quality being the cause of the former; important data for the characterization of the two men, both adjectives being referred to each. Comp. the corresponding description of Saul in 1 Sam. ix. 2 sq. and x. 24. David here looks at him only in the light of his God-given noble endowments and qualities, and praises them, turning his glance away (in view of his death) from the time during which the "evil spirit" had darkened and destroyed his nobility, and not thinking of the persecutions he himself had suffered.—**In life and in death—not divided.***—On the one hand David here bears witness to the cordial love that Saul felt for his son, traces of which we find in 1 Sam. xix. 6; xx. 2, though according to 1 Sam. xx. 30 sq. the evil spirit in him burned in hot anger even against Jonathan. On the other hand David here praises the filial love of Jonathan, in which he remained true to his father in spite of the latter's hatred and persecution of his friend, not permitting his friendship to diminish his filial piety. Equal in noble qualities of heart, bound together in life and death in cordial personal association, they had also the noblest heroic qualities in common: each was distinguished for *eagle-like swiftness* and *agility* (Isa. xl. 31; Deut. xxviii. 49; Jer. iv. 13; Lam. iv. 19; Hab. i. 8), for *lion-like courage* and *strength* (xvii. 10; Judg. xiv. 18; Prov. xxx. 30). How sorrowful, then, the loss!—Ver. 24. Saul's gracious free-handedness in dividing out the *booty of war*. Scarlet-red, purple or crimson (שָׁנִי, Ex. xxv. 4; Judg. v. 30; Prov. xxxi. 21).—**With delights** = in an amiable manner [or the "with" may = "and;" in scarlet and (other) delights.—Tr.].—To this costly clothing for women he added *golden* ornaments, brought along in the spoil of war. As the men are to mourn for the hero, so the women for the gracious king, who out of the booty of his battles has bestowed on them costly adornment.—[The poetical power of this appeal to the women of Israel, beautiful in itself, is heightened when we recollect that these women had once sung the war-praises of Saul, and were therefore the admirers of his prowess as well as the grateful recipients of his bounty. Womanly tenderness is to mourn the fallen hero, whom in his life womanly enthusiasm had celebrated.—Tr.]

Vers. 25, 26. *The special lamentation for Jonathan.* Ver. 25. The first part is a repetition of the lamentation in ver. 19 *b* with the addition: **in the midst of the battle.** Then follows first the lamentation over the fact of his death: **Jonathan on thy heights slain**, comp. ver. 19 *a*. David mentions him alone, in order to bemoan what he had lost in *him*, the dearly-loved friend. His union of *heart* with his *friend* differences this lament sharply from the foregoing over *him and Saul as heroes*.—**I am distressed**, *etc.*, thus *standing first* indicates that David's heart was deeply moved, and utterly given up to grief. **My brother**—the expression of the cordial brotherly love that united them.—**Very pleasant wast thou to me** must be understood as setting forth the deep impression that Jonathan made on him by his faithful, absorbing love. On this account, and because of the expression: "I am

* יַעֲרֵי וְהָרֵי מָוֶת [which is "unhebraic, and the first word ungrammatical" (Wellh.).—Tr.].

† שְׂדוֹת יְרֻמּוֹת.

‡ [A phrase from Luther's famous hymn (*Eine feste burg*) = "shield and weapon." For a translation see Carlyle's *Miscellanies*.—Tr.]

* [On the translation see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

distressed," the "thy love" can only = "thy love to me," not "my love to thee" (Bunsen). "David mourns for him not because *he himself* loved him, but because he has *lost* him" (Then.). "More wonderful, extraordinary"* than **the love of women**, the love that women bear—thus he sets forth the *deep devotion* of Jonathan's love, like that which is peculiar to women, and is the basis of the completest loving union between man and woman. Theodoret: "As they that are married are made one flesh by their union, so they that love one another perfectly are made one in soul by their disposition of mind." In these words David has not only reared to Jonathan a monument of friendship, but also borne testimony to that highest ideal of friendship (realized in him), which in the Old Testament was possible only on the basis of a common covenant of heart with the living God.

Ver. 27. The climacteric expression of sorrow after this declaration of highest loss in Jonathan's love: **How are the heroes fallen!** At this culmination of grief the lament again sounds the key-note of the whole, and returns in conclusion to its chief object, the sorrow for the hero-glory of Israel destroyed in *Saul and Jonathan*. For the concluding words: **The weapons of war are perished**, refer not to materials of war (Vulg., De Wette, Böttcher, *al.*). This would be a psychologically inconceivable transition, in sharpest contrast with the lofty tone of the Song, from the deepest, tenderest, innermost sorrow of heart for what the singer and all Israel had lost in these two heroes, to a lament which, as Thenius admirably says, a Napoleon might have made, but not a David. The "weapons of war" are the heroes considered as *instruments* of battle and war; comp. Isa. xiii. 5; Acts ix. 15 (σκεῦος). [The exquisite beauty of this Ode has been noted by all commentators. The artistic skill with which its successive thoughts are introduced is equal to the beauty and passionate tenderness of the thoughts themselves. The lament over Israel's glory slain—the picture of exulting foes—the imprecation on the spot of ground that witnessed and, as it were, permitted the misfortune—the praise of the military exploits of the heroes, their oneness, their strength—the appeal to the women—the picture of Jonathan's deep and faithful love—these are all exquisitely expressed and connected; the ode has unity, and yet, short as it is, has wonderful variety.—It is to be observed that the divine name does not occur in the song, nor does it contain any theocratic or religious thought. There is no reference to Jehovah's wrath, no prayer for Jehovah's interposition, no expression of resignation to the divine will. Whatever David may have thought of these things, he here says nothing about them. The elegy, therefore (though noble in feeling), is not religious; it is a national song, as the title seems to indicate, and is here chronicled by the historian as the speech of Jotham (Judg. ix.) or that of Tertullus (Acts xxiv.) is recorded—a gem of ancient Hebrew poetry, not only pleasing as poetry, but instructive in the light that it throws on the personages and events of the time.—TR.]

* The form נִפְלְאַתָה as if from a verb ל״ה [with אֶ for אָ]. Ges., § 75, 21 *a*, Ew. § 194, *b*.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. David's noble, *kingly disposition* is here splendidly *attested* in the *temptation* that the announcement of Saul's death brought him. Suddenly he sees himself freed from the persistent murderous persecutions of Saul, and the way open for his accession to the long-promised royal power and honor; how easily might his heart have abandoned itself, if not to malicious joy, at any rate to joy at God's righteous judgment on his enemy, and the restoration of quiet in his life and peace in his land! How human and natural it would seem if he expressed satisfaction at Saul's end and its results for himself! Instead of this we see in David's words and conduct in the presence of this terrible catastrophe *the noblest and purest unselfishness*, and concern only for the sacred interests of Israel as the people of the Lord. Looking altogether away from himself and his royal calling, he immerses himself with his men in mourning for the national calamity, for the downfall of the army of *the Lord*, for the violation done to the Lord's honor in the defeat of His people. He shows deep, true sorrow for Saul's death, looking away from all that Saul had done to him, and taking note only of what he was for Israel in his royal calling as Anointed of the Lord. Further, he without envy celebrates him as the glory of Israel in the elegy, which contemplates Saul only as military hero, but as such from the theocratic point of view in his quality of leader of the people and army of *the Lord*. As he acted theocratically with perfect justice in slaying in holy anger the Amalekite as the murderer of the Lord's anointed, giving no room in his heart to revenge, so he stands on the summit of the theocratic view, when in his elegy he celebrates Saul as the national hero and consecrated leader of Israel, being wholly free from bitterness and anger at the suffering that Saul had so long inflicted on him. All selfish feeling vanishes, in the presence of the slaughtered people and the slain king, in the general theocratic concern for Israel and in the consciousness of the Lord's control over His people with the army and its leaders. "David's lament over Saul and Jonathan is the consecration of completion that is poured out over the attestation of his royal disposition" (Baumgarten). It is "a monument of his noble unrevengeful spirit. He who can so speak of the enemy who has for years sought his life and inflicted on his soul wounds that never heal, can certainly not be charged with revenge" (Hengst., Ps. iv. 298 sq.).

2. While he thus exhibits a noble, high-hearted disposition, David also presents an example of true *love of enemies*, being not merely free from all *feeling* of revenge in the *heart*, making no complaint or accusation concerning the wrong done him, uttering no word of *joy* over the judgment that has befallen his enemy, but mourning his fall as that of a friend, avenging in holy anger the insult offered to God in his person, and dwelling with just recognition and praise on the good with which God has endowed him.

3. As David did, so must every servant of God

keep *the good and righteous cause* for which he fights and suffers (whether it be merely personal, or also a matter of God's kingdom) free and pure from the self-seeking that mingles therewith under the pretence of furthering and completing it, that he may not set himself at variance with God's holy will, whose wise direction prepares right ways for it, nor with the ends of his kingdom which can never be furthered by sinful means. He who employs the sin of the world for a cause good and holy in itself, so as to make himself partaker of this sin, treads the path of falsehood and destruction, and desecrates the name and the aims of the kingdom of God.

4. Sincere *love of enemies* has its *root* in a heart purified from selfishness and in fellowship with the living God, which seeks not its own, but looks only to God's love and honor. *For God's sake* the truly God-fearing man loves his enemy. And so love to enemies shows itself in such main features as are here described: in the putting away of all revengeful feeling, in the refraining from a strictly justifiable condemnation in view of God's completed judgment, in silence of heart and mouth before God and man as to the evil that the enemy has done, in covering the sin that the Lord has visited or will visit, in recognizing what was good and praise-worthy in the enemy, and what he was and what he accomplished by God's will and endowment for his kingdom, in praising the name of God for all whereby the Lord even in the person and life of the enemy has maintained His honor and exhibited His merciful and long-suffering love.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Wonderful is God's management in the life of His people. When through the entanglement of their life with the world their anxieties and afflictions have risen highest, the Lord suddenly causes things to take a turn that puts an end to all need and conflict, and introduces a thorough-going help that brings all temptations and trials of faith to a wholesome conclusion.—To those who are distinguished in the kingdom of God as specially called and favored instruments of His grace, falsehood and hypocrisy draw near most pressingly and corruptingly in the guise of humility and self-abasement.—Children of God should not betake themselves to the ways of unrighteousness and self-will, in order to attain the goal set up for them; they can reach this only through decided rejection of the means offered and commended to them by the tempting world.—The God-fearing man sees in the misfortune that strikes his enemy the judicial righteousness of God, and accordingly lets no feeling of revenge or of rejoicing at injury to others gain a place in his heart, and is humbly silent when the Lord speaks. Rather does he mourn over the fall of his opponent, and over the damage that has been done not only to the opponent, but to the common good cause.—Love to an enemy is righteous in that it recognizes the good in an opponent without envy and without reserve, and thankfully recognizes what God has done in his case according to His own goodness and mercy.—Even amid the most painful experiences we should be quick to discern the stamp of divine nobility in an immortal human soul.—When we behold God's hand righteously smiting men from whom as our persecutors and foes we have had to suffer for the sake of God's cause and kingdom, we should keep our eyes open against the sin which wishes to anticipate God's will and assail the life of our opposers: we should by word and deed testify in holy wrath against conduct so offensive to God.

Ver. 1 sq. SCHLIER: God the Lord has for every one of us also fixed His aim, and though it be no royal crown that is destined for us, yet about us all God has long ago formed His special plan. The way to reach this end is the way of duty, the way of quiet, faithful obedience to God's will. In such a way we come to the goal. Think of David, to whom the crown was promised, and who in order to obtain it did absolutely nothing else than his duty, and how beautifully did David reach the goal! without his asking, the crown was laid at his feet.—Ver. 2. CRAMER: Hypocrites turn their cloak according to the wind, and worship the rising more than the setting sun; but He who deals hypocritically with his neighbor prepares a net for his own feet (Prov. xxix. 5).—Ver. 3. OSIANDER: Those who wish to deceive other people mix truth and falsehood together, in order that they may sell one along with the other, like good and bad wares (Ja. iii. 10–12).

[Ver. 10. HALL: Worldly minds think no man can be of any other than their own diet; and because they find the respects of self-love, and private profit, so strongly prevailing with themselves, they cannot conceive how these should be capable of a repulse from others.—HENRY: David had been long waiting for the crown, and now it is brought him by an Amalekite. See how God can serve His own purpose of kindness to His people, even by designing men, who aim at nothing but to set up themselves. —TR.]

Vers. 11, 12. For him who has the Holy Spirit it is not impossible to love his enemies.—SCHLIER: Who among us has such a persecutor as David had in Saul? What we have in the worst case is one or another opposer, who injures us or hurts our feelings. And yet how full we are of hate! and even if we do our opposer no evil, how glad we are when evil befalls him! Of this we will be ashamed, we will learn better the love of enemies. We are Christians, and as Christians have double cause to follow Him who for us, His enemies, gave up His life.—F. W. KRUMMACHER: O how it should shame us, already in the days of the Old Testament to meet with a love of enemies such as here manifests itself in David, while it must with sincerity, truth and candor be confessed that among us, though we know the revelation of love to sinners in Christ, it belongs, alas! to the rarest pearls.—Ver. 16. It was indignation at such an outrage when David caused the regicide to be slain, and such indignation proceeded from fear of God, and at such a moment there was nothing like calculating prudence to be found in David. But in truth the fear of the Lord is always at the same time true prudence.—[David's course in this matter was the best *policy* for him; but we have no right to conclude from that fact that he was led to it by con-

siderations of policy. He had himself shown, on an occasion of great temptation (1 Sam. xxiv. 6), that reverence for the Lord's anointed of which he here speaks. The fact that "honesty is the best policy" will not of itself alone make a man honest; but neither does it *prevent* a man's being honest, or give us a right to suspect a good man's motives.—TR.]

Ver. 17. S. SCHMID: When a man dies, it is for the first time seen how people have been disposed towards him during his life.—Ver. 20. KRUMMACHER: The word: "Tell it not in Gath," *etc.*, has since become a proverb in believing circles. It is often heard when one of their number has not guarded his feet, and has somewhere given offence. Would that this call were but more faithfully lived up to than is for the most part the case! Would that the honor of the spiritual Zion lay everywhere as near the heart of the children of the kingdom as to David's heart that of the earthly Zion! But how often it happens that they are even zealous to uncover the nakedness of their brethren, and by this renewal of Ham's offence become traitors in the Church which Christ has purchased with His blood. They thus make themselves partakers in the guilt of calumniating the gospel, in that they open the way for it by their perhaps thoroughly malicious tale-telling.—SCHLIER: Do but let us once learn to love our fellow-man, not for the sake of what he is or deserves, but for the Lord's sake who demands it of us; then shall we, even when we suffer injustice, for all that not be wanting in love, but shall understand the blessed art of showing love even where we find no love! How it ought to shame us though that David, after long banishment and tribulation, feels nothing at the death of Saul but mourning and lamentation.—Where office and calling does not otherwise demand, we should be silent as to the evil done by a dead man, especially when it was a prince or a king; love should cover all that, should find no joy in saying much of the faults of others. But it should be to us a rightful concern and a holy joy to bring to light the good that another has done.—["*De mortuis nil nisi bonum.*"—TR.]

[Ver. 23. How could David sincerely speak thus? There came back to him now the recollection of those bright days when he dwelt peacefully as Saul's son and Jonathan's brother, and his heart melted into tenderness as he recalled the amiable traits which not only his dear friend Jonathan, but even Saul in his better moments, had manifested. Eulogies over the dead often seem insincere or exaggerated to those who know not the memories awakened.—Ver. 26. To say, as is sometimes done, that the Scriptures speak of the love of *Christ* as "passing the love of women," is utterly unwarrantable "accommodation."—TR.]

[Vers. 1–16. *A cunning schemer failing and perishing;* 1) Amid bloodshed and mortal agony he coolly lays a deep scheme to promote his own interest. 2) He makes a cunning mixture of truth and falsehood (David could not know, and we cannot tell, just how much of it was true)—as deep schemers usually do. 3) He calculates on the narrow selfishness of human nature—commonly a very safe basis of calculation. 4) He is foiled by encountering such generosity, loyalty and justice as he has not been used to and did not look for (vers. 11–15). The shrewdest schemers sometimes mistake their man. 5) His plan issues in benefit to another, but only ruin to himself. In this world which so abounds in selfish schemers and tempters there is yet a grace that can sustain and a Providence that overrules.—TR.]

[Vers. 19–27: HENRY: The excellent spirit which David here shows: 1) Very generous to his enemy, Saul; *a*) conceals his faults, *b*) praises what is worthy. 2) Very grateful to Jonathan, his sworn friend; *a*) nothing more delightful in this world than a true friend, *b*) nothing more distressful than the loss of such a friend. 3) Deeply concerned for the honor of God (ver. 20). 4) Deeply concerned for the public welfare. The beauty of Israel slain (ver. 19), the mighty fallen (vers. 19, 25, 27).—TR.]

SECOND SECTION.

CHAP. II. 1—III. 6.

I. *David anointed King over Judah—dwells in Hebron.* Chap. ii. 1–7.

1 AND it came to pass after this, that David inquired of the Lord [Jehovah], say-
ing, Shall I go up into any [one] of the cities of Judah? And the Lord [Jehovah]
said unto him, Go up. And David said, Whither shall I go up? And he said,
2 Unto Hebron. So [And] David went up thither, and his two wives also, Ahinoam
the Jezreelitess and Abigail, Nabal's wife [the wife of Nabal] the Carmelite.[1]

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 2. On the fem. form (כרמלית) here given in some MSS. see notes on 1 Sam. xxvii. 3; xxx. 5.—TR.]

3 And his[2] men that were with him did David bring up, every man with his house-
4 hold; and they dwelt in the cities of Hebron. And the men of Judah came, and
there they anointed David king over the house of Judah.
And they told David, saying, That the men of Jabesh-Gilead *were they*[3] that
5 buried Saul. And David sent messengers unto the men of Jabesh-Gilead, and
said unto them, Blessed be ye of the Lord [Jehovah] that ye have showed this
6 kindness unto your lord, *even* [*om.* even] unto Saul, and have buried him. And
now, the Lord [Jehovah] show [do] kindness and truth unto you; and I also will
7 [*om.* will][4] requite [do] you this kindness, because ye have done this thing. There-
fore [And] now, let your hands be strengthened [strong], and be ye valiant; for
your master [lord] Saul is dead, and also [*ins.* me] the house of Judah have [have
the house, *etc.*] anointed me [*om.* me] king over them.

II. *Ishbosheth's anti-godly Elevation to the Throne of all Israel through Abner, and the consequent long Contest between the House of Saul and the House of David.* Chap. ii. 8—iii. 6.

8 But [And] Abner, the son of Ner, captain of Saul's host, took Ishbosheth the
9 son of Saul, and brought him over to Mahanaim, And made him king over [for][5]
Gilead and over [for] the Ashurites and over [for] Jezreel, and over Ephraim and
10 over Benjamin and over all Israel. Ishbosheth, Saul's son, was forty years old
when he began to reign over Israel, and reigned two years; but[6] the house of Judah
11 followed David.[7] And the time that David was king in Hebron over the house of
12 Judah was seven years and six months. And Abner the son of Ner, and the ser-
13 vants of Ishbosheth the son of Saul went out from Mahanaim to Gibeon. And
Joab the son of Zeruiah and the servants of David went out; and [*ins.* they] met
together[8] by the pool of Gibeon; and they sat down, the one [these] on the one
14 side of the pool, and the other [those] on the other side of the pool. And Abner

[2] [Ver. 3. Sept. reads "the men," which better accords with Greek and Eng. idiom (Erdmann so has it in the Exposition), but hardly calls for a change in the Heb. text. Further on Sept. omits the verb "did bring up," thus attaching the noun "men" to the verb of the preceding verse. The Syr. also has difficulty with this sentence, making the Hiphil into Qal, and inserting "and David" at the beginning of the verse, so as to read: "and David and his men were with him; and David went up and the men of his house, and they abode in Hebron." These readings seem to substantiate the Heb. text, only they had וַיַּעֲלוּ instead of הֶעֱלָה, which the Sept. then omitted as superfluous. The Heb. Hiphil is preferable because it introduces a new statement, while the Syr. merely repeats.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 4. So Erdmann, Philippson, Maurer; but Wellhausen declares it to be an impossible construction in prose. If not impossible, it is unusual and hard, and the simple rendering of the Syr. and Vulg.: "the men of Jabesh-Gilead buried Saul," commends itself, except that, as this is probably the answer to a question: "who buried Saul?" we should expect the subject "the men of Jabesh-Gilead" to be put as the principal and essential part of the answer. The true form of the sentence is not apparent.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 6. The Fut. rendering is found in Sept., Sym., Vulg., and the idea "requite" in the two last; but the context (with the present text) points to the Pres., and it is better to render the Heb. verb (עשׂה) uniformly. Against Thenius Wellhausen insists that the אֶעֱשֶׂה cannot be rendered as Pres. (this would require עָשִׂיתִי), and, since the Fut. does not accord with the הַזֹּאת, he would for the latter substitute תַּחַת, and render: "I will do you good because (= in place that) ye have done," *etc.* (so the Vulg.), which certainly gives a more appropriate sense, though the rendering of Thenius (and Erdmann) is not impossible.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 9. The literal rendering of the Prep. (אֶל) is here (with Erdmann) in these three cases retained, in contrast with the following עַל, "over," because an error of text does not here seem probable, in spite of the fact that ancient and modern translators (without exception, as far as I know) neglect the difference. Erdmann attempts in the Exposition to point out the difference of meaning between the two Prepositions in the connection.—Instead of "Ashurites" many read "Geshurites."—The last word of the verse כֻּלֹּה presents an example of a 3 pers. masc. suffix (ה) usually considered to be archaic for ו; the fem. pointing (כֻּלָּהּ) would be possible, if "Israel" were considered in its national unity, or as a land.—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 10. אַךְ = "only, however," but the rendering "only" would here be ambiguous.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 10. Vers. 10 and 11 are variously handled. Erdmann inclines to follow Thenius in regarding 10 *b* and 11 as parenthesis, Wellhausen regards 10 *a* and 11 as interpolations, connecting 10 *b* with ver. 12. The difficulties in the figures do not prove ungenuineness of the text, since these may be corrupted by copyists, and the summary chronological statements are natural and in accordance with the manner of our Book. The better view is that the Redactor has inserted as summary statement in his narrative either vers. 10, 11, or 10 *a*, 11. The objection to Thenius' view (which connects 10 *a* with 12) is that 10 *a* is clearly the ordinary formula for the length of a king's reign and his age at his accession, and therefore an independent sentence. See the remarks on 1 Sam. xiii. 1.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 13. The use of the Acc. suffix and also the adv. יַחְדָּו is remarkable, since either (as expressing the idea of concurrence) would seem to exclude the other. We should expect either simply: "they met them at the pool," or "they met at the pool together." The present text may have arisen from the combination of the two constructions.—Tr.]

said to Joab, Let the young men now [*om.* now] arise and play before us. And
15 Joab said, Let them arise. Then there arose and went over by number twelve of
Benjamin, *which* [who] *pertained*[9] to Ishbosheth, the son of Saul, and twelve of
16 the servants of David. And they caught every one his fellow by the head, and
thrust[10] his sword into his fellow's side, so they fell [and fell] down dead together;
wherefore [and] that place was called Helkath-hazzurim,[11] which is in Gibeon.
17 And there was a very sore battle that day, and Abner was beaten, and the men of
Israel, before the servants of David.
18 And there were three sons of Zeruiah there, Joab and Abishai and Asahel; and
19 Asahel was as light of foot as a wild roe [gazelle]. And Asahel pursued after
Abner, and in going he turned not [he turned not to go] to the right hand nor to
20 the left from following Abner. Then [And] Abner looked behind him and said,
21 Art thou Asahel? And he answered [said], I am. And Abner said to him, Turn
thee aside to thy right hand or to thy left, and lay thee hold on one of the young
men, and take thee his armor. But Asahel would not turn aside from following
22 of [*om* of] him. And Abner said again to Asahel, Turn thee aside from following
me; wherefore should I smite thee to the ground? how then should I hold up
23 my face to Joab thy brother? Howbeit [And] he refused to turn aside; wherefore [and] Abner with the hinder end of the spear smote him under the fifth rib
[in the abdomen],[12] that [and] the spear came out behind him, and he fell down
there and died in the same place [on the spot]; and it came to pass that as many
as came to the place where Asahel fell down and died stood still.
24 Joab also [And Joab] and Abishai pursued after Abner; and the sun went
down when they were come [and they came] to the hill of Ammah, that *lieth* be-
25 fore Giah[13] by the way of the wilderness of Gibeon. And the children of Benjamin
gathered themselves together after Abner, and became one troop, and stood on the
26 top of an hill. Then [And] Abner called to Joab and said, Shall the sword de-
vour forever? knowest thou not that it will be bitterness in the latter end? how
long shall it be then, ere thou bid the people return from following their brethren?
27 And Joab said, As God liveth, unless thou hadst spoken, surely [*om.* surely] then[14]
28 in the morning the people had gone up every one from following his brother. So
[And] Joab blew a trumpet, and all the people stood still, and pursued after
29 Israel no more, neither fought they any more. And Abner and his men walked
all that night through the plain, and passed over Jordan, and went through all
30 [*ins.* the] Bithron, and they [*om.* they] came to Mahanaim. And Joab returned

[9] [Ver. 15. The ו is either appositional, — "namely," or it indicates that Ishbosheth had other soldiers besides Benjaminites.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver 16. Some insert (after Sept.) the word "hand" (יָדוֹ) after the first verb and read: "they laid every man his hand on the head of his fellow, and his sword into his fellow's side," on which see Erdmann. Böttcher adopts this reading, only he puts the Aramaic form (which he supposes to be popular) איד instead of the Heb. יד, in order to account for its falling out after אִישׁ. This supposition of an Aramaic reading is somewhat forced, and the Heb. is intelligible without the insertion of the word "hand," which is found in no other ancient version.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 16. This word of doubtful meaning is properly left untranslated in Eng. A. V. The various proposed renderings are discussed by Erdmann.—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 23. חֹמֶשׁ. Not one of the ancient VSS. renders this word "fifth rib," Sept. "loins" (ψόα), Syr. "breast," Chald. "side of the loins," Vulg "*inguen*;" among moderns only Cahen maintains it, after Rashi and the Talmud (*Sanhedrin* 49, *a*). Gesenius and Fürst connect the word with a root (found in Arabic), meaning "to be fat or strong."—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 24. To the reading of the verse Wellhausen objects: 1) that a *way* is stated to be the goal of the pursuit; 2) that the pursuit, starting from Gibeon (ver. 16), nevertheless ends *on the way to* Gibeon; 3) that the name Giah is unknown and suspicious. He therefore substitutes גֵּי, "ravine," for גִּיחַ, supposing that the scribe designed to locate the hill Ammah appropriately by a valley; but as the combination "valley of the way" thus obtained gives no sense, he finally throws out the גֵּי and reads: "opposite the way of the wilderness" (remarking very justly that roads in Palestine, being unchangeable, answered as well as rivers for topographical definition). Here this generally acute critic has made difficulties for himself. For 1) the pursuit ends not on a road, but at a hill on a certain road; 2) the pursuit is not said not to have reached Gibeon, but to have reached a point on the road to the wilderness of Gibeon, which may have been of considerable extent; 3) as to Giah, many otherwise unknown names occur once in the Old Testament. It is not necessary to suppose that the hill of ver. 25 is identical with Ammah in ver. 24, or to change the אַחַת into אַמָּה or something else.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 27. Literally: "at that time from the morning." The second כִּי, rendered in Eng. A. V. "surely," is better taken as repetition of the first, the Conj. introducing the clause, — that, and usually omitted in English.—Tr.]

from following Abner; and when [*om.* when] he had [*om.* had] gathered all the
people together, [*ins.* and] there lacked of David's servants nineteen men and Asa-
31 hel. But [And] the servants of David had smitten of Benjamin and of Abner's
32 men, *so that*[15] three hundred and three-score men died. And they took up Asahel
and buried him in the sepulchre of his father which was in Bethlehem.[16] And
Joab and his men went all night, and they [*om.* they] came to Hebron at break
of day.

CHAP. III. 1 Now [And] there was long war between the house of Saul and the
house of David; but [and] David waxed stronger and stronger, and the house of
2 Saul waxed weaker and weaker. And unto David were sons born[17] in Hebron;
3 and his first-born was Amnon, of Ahinoam the Jezreelitess; And his second, Chi-
leab, of Abigail, the wife of Nabal the Carmelite; and the third, Absalom the son
4 of Maacah the daughter of Talmai king of Geshur; And the fourth, Adonijah the
5 son of Haggith; and the fifth, Shephatiah the son of Abital; And the sixth, Ith-
ream, by Eglah David's wife. These were born to David in Hebron. And it
came to pass, while there was war between the house of Saul and the house of
David, that Abner made himself strong for the house of Saul.

[15] [Ver. 31. The text here is corrupt; but it is not easy to restore it. The Chald. follows the Heb. word by word; the Vulg. inserts the Rel. Pron.: "three hundred and sixty who also died;" the Syr. omits the verb "died" in ver. 31, and inserts it (Sing.) at the end of ver. 30. Literally the Heb. reads: "smote of Benjamin, *etc.*, three hundred and sixty men, they died." Not only is the syntax impossible, but also the addition of the statement that the smitten men died is unusual, being involved in the word "smite" (according to the Heb. usage). The simplest course would be to omit the word "died," and read "smote . . . . three hundred and sixty men." Perhaps a marginal explanation has here gotten into the text (Wellh.).—TR.]

[16] [Ver. 32. Some MSS. insert בְּ before בית לחם.—TR.]

[17] [Ver. 2. Kethib is Pual, Qeri Niphal. For an example of the latter see xiv. 27. The text-form may be Perf. Pual, וְיֻלְּדוּ; but some prefer to regard it as Impf., וַיְּלְּדוּ for וַיְיֻלְּדוּ, as the Pual Partcp. occurs without the preformative מְ.—TR.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

I. Ch. ii. 1–7. *David's elevation to the throne of Judah, and his residence in Hebron.*—Ver. 1. The *inquiry* of the Lord was made through *Urim and Thummim*, comp. 1 Sam. xxiii. 2, 10 sq.; xxx. 7, 8 sq. The high-priest Abiathar with the Ephod was with David, 1 Sam. xxii. 30; xxiii. 6. At this decisive turning-point of his unquiet life he wished to know the will of the Lord. The "after this" refers to all that is narrated in ch. i. and 1 Sam. xxxi. The motive for inquiring of the Lord is thereby at the same time indicated. He saw that the promise of the kingdom was now to be fulfilled to him. As he could no longer remain in the land of the Philistines, but must return to his country, and as the northern part of the land was held by the Philistines, the return to the territory of *his own tribe* was most natural; for there, where he had a long time found refuge (1 Sam. xxii. 5), he might count on a large following (1 Sam. xxx. 26 sq.) and firm support and protection against the remains of Saul's army under Abner. To the *first question* he receives from the Lord the definite answer that he is to return to Judah. To the *second question:* "Whither?" the answer is: "*To Hebron.*" This city, situated in a valley (Gen. xxxvii. 14) in the most mountainous, and therefore the safest part of Judah, held to be a holy place from the recollections of the Patriarchal time, one of the principal places in the Tribe of Judah, an ancient royal city and a *priestly* city (Josh. xii. 10; xxi. 11), must now have had for David a very special importance, which appeared all the clearer from the divine decision and in respect to his future life became indubitable; here now was to be fulfilled the old Patriarchal promise (Gen. xlix. 8 sq.), the establishment of the theocratic kingdom *in the Tribe of Judah.*

Ver. 2 sq. In accordance with the will and direction of his God he went thither with his whole *family*. But also **the men that were with him** (comp. 1 Sam. xxvii. 2). he led thither into *the cities of Hebron,* that is, the places that belonged to the district of Hebron;* **every man with his house**, a complete and permanent colonization of David's entire following took place, the foundation of David's royal authority, which was established with its seat in Hebron. For it is forthwith declared in ver. 4 *a* that the "*men of Judah,*" that is, the elders as the representatives of the Tribe *anointed* him *king* over the *house* (the tribe) of Judah. See ch. v. 3, where the *elders* of all Israel come to make him king over the whole nation. The first anointment received from Samuel (1 Sam. xvi.) denoted the divine consecration to the royal office; this second one, performed by the Elders of Judah, was the public solemn installation of David (based on that anointment) into this office.

* [On Hebron (twenty miles south of Jerusalem) see the books of travel and Bible-dictionaries. Stanley has given in his "*History of the Jewish Church,*" Vol. I., App. II., an interesting account of the visit of the Prince of Wales thither in 1862. *Bib. Com.* calls attention to the unusual phrase "cities of Hebron," as if Hebron were the name of a district, the common designation of dependent towns being "villages" or "daughters" (Josh. xv. 36; Num. xxi. 25). No doubt the name of the city Hebron attached itself to the surrounding district. —TR.]

Comp. Saul's first anointment by Samuel (1 Sam. x. 1) and his subsequent public inauguration as king by the Elders, 1 Sam. x. 24; xi. 15.—So two anointments of Solomon are described, 1 Chron. xxiii. 1 sq.; xxix. 22. The anointing of David was perhaps hastened because Abner's purpose (ver. 8 sq.) was already known. [On the motives of the Tribe of Judah in making David their king see Chandler's "*Life of David*," Bk. II., ch. 30.—Tr.]

Vers. 4 *b*–7. *David's first act as king.* The message to the Jabeshites with thanks for their burial of Saul and the announcement of his anointing as king.—**And they told David, saying** (Luther: And when it was told David that) **the men of Jabesh are they that buried Saul.** (The form) of this sentence would certainly be somewhat "hard and ill-constructed" (Then.), but for the obvious pre-supposition that David, having heard of and deeply lamented Saul's death on the battle-field, inquired whether the body of the "Anointed of the Lord" had been rescued from the hands of the uncircumcised and buried in the sacred soil of his native land. S. Schmid well remarks of this explanation (which Tremellius has) that "it accords with David's piety." It is thus natural to suppose that David, now by God's providence king in Saul's stead, in consequence of the afflicting news that had wrung from him such a lament, purposes to give a becoming royal burial to the man whose person had always been sacred to him, and whose heroic greatness and virtues he had so passionately celebrated. There is therefore no need for the bold emendation of Thenius (after Vulg. and Sept.), who would read simply: "it was told David that the men of Jabesh buried Saul."*—On the burial by the faithful and grateful Jabeshites of the bodies of Saul and his sons brought away from Bethshean, see 1 Sam. xxxi. 11 sq.—Ver. 5. The *message* to the Jabeshites was couched in the tone of royal authority. It conveys 1) *a grateful invocation of blessing* for the noble deed of love that they have wrought on Saul by burying him; the phrase "your lord" indicates that they had herein acted as became their relation to Saul as their king and lord.—Ver. 6. **And now the Lord do to you kindness and truth.**—This is the expansion of the wish of blessing in ver. 5. The first noun (חֶסֶד), *favor, kindness* is not merely pardoning grace (Keil), but in general the gracious love that God shows His people on the ground of His covenant with them. The second (אֱמֶת), *truth* is the trustworthiness and attestation of all His promises. David wishes them all exhibitions of the love and faithfulness of the Lord for the faithful love which they showed king Saul even in his death.—**And I also do you this good, because ye have done this thing;** the good that he does them is not merely this wish for the divine blessing (Keil), or therewith a gift of honor (Bunsen), but this honorable royal embassy with expression of thanks and invocation of blessing. The rendering: "And I also wish to show you *such kindness*" (S. Schmid, Clericus, De Wette) gives no appropriate sense, whether the comparison be referred to God's goodness or to the deed of the Jabeshites. Thenius excellently: "greeting you with blessing by my ambassadors."—[Eng. A. V., Patrick and Philippson give the incorrect future rendering.—Tr.]—Ver. 7 adds 2) *encouragement and exhortation:* **let your hands be strong** means not: be consoled! but: "be of *strong courage.*" And be **sons of power** [valiant], that is, show yourselves brave men and unappalled. [The phrase means in general "men of force," the context showing whether the force intended is moral, intellectual or physical. The word (חַיִל) is used of Ruth (Ruth iii. 11) and of the "virtuous woman" in Prov. xxxi. 10, and elsewhere of warlike valor and of wealth. *Bib. Com.:* the opposite of "men of virtue" are "men of Belial," that is, men of no force of character.—Tr.]—The *ground* (כִּי) of this exhortation is at the same time the explanation of its importance for the interests of David as anointed king. In the reason assigned he shows them not directly, but indirectly that he has been made *king of Judah, their king* Saul being dead. But his exhortation to valor and courage is intelligible only on the supposition that he gives them to understand that for them also he has taken Saul's place as king, and that they must valiantly espouse and defend his cause against his enemies, the party of Saul under the lead of Abner. It is not clear whether or not Ishbosheth had at this time been already set up as king by Abner. But from ver. 9 (which states that Gilead was one of the districts gained by Abner for Ishbosheth) it is evident that David, seeing Abner's movement thither (comp. 1 Sam. xxvi. 7), must have been concerned to secure to himself the capital city [Jabesh] of this province (Joseph., *Ant.* VI. 5, 1). Whether he succeeded in this is questionable. His demand that it should recognize him as king was justly founded on his *divine call* to be king over the whole people in Saul's stead, comp. iii. 9, 10. So certainly along with sincere gratitude "there was policy in this embassy" (Then.), but it was a thoroughly justifiable theocratic policy.

II. Chap. ii. 8—iii. 6. *Ishbosheth's antigodly elevation to the throne of Israel by Abner and the thence resulting war.*—Ver. 8. On Abner see 1 Sam. xiv. 50.—**He had taken Ishbosheth the son of Saul, and brought him over to Mahanaim,** that is, across the Jordan. Ishbosheth had probably taken part in the unfortunate battle of Gilboa, and as he survived, Abner his uncle saved him together with the force under his command in the flight across the Jordan (1 Sam. xxxi. 7), in order to keep the kingdom in the house of Saul. This retreat across the Jordan passed from Bethshean or Mount Gilboa south-east into Gilead, where not the city Jabesh (as we might expect from the foregoing), but *Mahanaim* (that is, "two camps," Gen. xxxii. 2) be-

* Sept. has אֲשֶׁר (= quod) after לֵאמֹר, and the latter is omitted by Vulg.; Thenius hence supposes that לֵאמֹר got into the text by mistake (through careless looking) for אֲשֶׁר, and that the latter, being added by way of supplement in the margin, thence got into the wrong place in the text. [See "Text. and Gram." —Tr.]

came the abode of Ishbosheth. In the division of the land this place was assigned to the Tribe of Gad, and lay on the border between it and the half-tribe of Manasseh (Josh. xiii. 26, 30) on the Jabbok [the present Wady Zerqa]. It was afterwards given to the Levites, Josh. xxi. 38. At a later period David found refuge there in his flight from Absalom, xvii. 24.—*Ishbosheth* according to 1 Chron. viii. 33; ix. 39, was Saul's fourth son, while in 1 Sam. xiv. 49 only three are named, who also fell with him in the battle, 1 Sam. xxxi. 2. But in Chronicles he is called *Eshbaal*, that is, "Fire of Baal" [or "man of Baal."—Tr.]. For the name of the god Baal in Hos. ix. 10; Jer. iii. 24, is put as equivalent *bosheth* [shame] in order to indicate the reproach and shame of idol-worship (comp. Isa. xlii. 17; xlv. 16). So for Gideon's surname Jerubbaal (Judg. vi. 32; viii. 35) we find Jerubbesheth (2 Sam. xi. 21). Similarly the name *Eshbaal* was changed into *Ishbosheth*="man of shame or disgrace." Ewald's supposition that *bosheth* was originally used in a good sense="reverence, awe," is without foundation, and is in opposition to the fact that the word occurs only in a bad sense. It is therefore a natural conjecture that the change of Eshbaal to Ishbosheth had reference to the shame and disgrace that befell Saul's house in the person of this his last son, Ps. xxxv. 26 being thus fulfilled.—[It seems more probable that the name Baal = lord was in early times given to the God of Israel, and proper names were formed from it, as Eshbaal or Ishbaal = man of the lord; afterwards when the worship of the false Baal was introduced into Israel, the change above-described was made. Possibly this change was made by later editors and scribes, and the original form was retained in the Book of Chronicles because this book was less read than the prophetic historical books.—Tr.]—That Ishbosheth was a weak, characterless tool in the hand of Abner for the maintenance of the interests of the fallen royal house is already intimated in the words: *And Abner took Ishbosheth and carried him over.*—Mahanaim was fitted by its position to be a refuge for Ishbosheth and the remains of the defeated army.—Ver. 9. **And made him king**, as being in his view the legitimate heir to Saul's royal throne. Then follows the statement of the districts over which Abner extended Ishbosheth's authority: he made him king **for Gilead**, in which was the central point of his dominion, Mahanaim, whence consequently the territory of the two and a half east-jordanic tribes in the first place, which in contrast with the west-jordanic Canaan (Josh. xxii. 9, 13, 15, 32; Judg. v. 17; xx. 1) is put as equivalent to *Gilead*, was claimed for Ishbosheth. The change of prepositions, three times "to, for" (אֶל), and three times "over" (עַל), is neglected by all the versions, which take the first as equivalent to the second. The difference, however, is to be retained; see Ew., § 217 *i* and *c*. The former, as sign of movement "to" [occurring in the Hebrew text with Gilead, the Ashurites and Jezreel], indicates those regions over which Abner gradually extended Ishbosheth's authority, being obliged to wrest them from the Philistines by continued wars; for it cannot be doubted that the Philistines followed the flying Israelites across the Jordan, and that after the battle of Gilboa the districts of the Ashurites and Jezreel remained securely in their possession. It is obvious that the "Ashurites" here cannot be the Arabian tribe of Asshurim in Gen. xxv. 3 (Maur.) nor the Assyrians. The Chald. has "over the tribe of Asher;" but, apart from the in that case strange insertion of the Article (Then.), this explanation does not accord with the position of the other districts here mentioned, according to which the territory of Asher must have embraced also that of Zebulon and Naphtali, which is not supposable. According to the view of Bachienne cited by Keil the reference is to the city Asher (Josh. xvii. 7) with its territory, since this city lay south-east of Jezreel, and Abner might well from Gilead have first subjected this region to Ishbosheth. But in that case (Keil) no reason appears why the name of the inhabitants (Ashurites) is given instead of that of the city (Asher), and the mention of a city among districts is improbable. The best way out of the difficulty is to adopt the reading "Geshurites" found in Vulg., Syr. and Ar., and approved by Then., Winer (*R. W.* I. 414) and Ewald. This misreading might easily have gotten into the text. This *Geshur* cannot, however, be the district whose inhabitants, "Geshurim"="bridgemen," appear in the south of Palestine in connection with Philistia (Josh. xiii. 2), and are mentioned along with Girzites and Amalekites (1 Sam. xxvii. 8); nor can it be the little kingdom of Geshur which belonged to *Syria* (xv. 8), and there formed an independent State (iii. 3; xiii. 37; xiv. 23). From this latter is to be distinguished (against Keil) a district of the same name which (Deut. iii. 14 sq.; Josh. xii. 5 sq.) with the region of the Maachathites on the west formed the border of the kingdom of Bashan and at the same time touched Gilead. But the Maachathites dwelt on the southwestern declivity of Hermon, at the sources of the Jordan (so Jerome). We shall therefore have to look for the Geshurites (whose district is named also in Josh. xiii. 11 along with both Gilead and Hermon) together with the Maachathites south of Hermon in the upper Jordan-region on both sides of the river. That this district is to be distinguished from the independent "kingdom" of Geshur in Syria is clear also from Josh. xiii. 13: "the children of Israel drove not out the Geshurites and the Maachathites, and Geshur and Maachath have dwelt among Israel to this day," whence it appears that it belonged to the Israelitish territory. The name *Geshur* (Bridgeland) it doubtless received from the numerous crossings that connected the two banks of the Jordan (Winer, Thenius).—**And for Jezreel**—this district called after the city of the same name, the scene of the great battle in which Israel succumbed to the Philistines, was the great fruitful plain (τὸ μέγα πεδίον, 1 Mac. xii. 49; Jos., *Ant.* XV. 1, 22 u. s.) whose recovery must have particularly occupied Abner.—To these three great regions, which are mentioned in geographical order, are added, going from north to south (with the preposition עַל, "over"), the tribe-territories of *Ephraim* and *Benjamin*.—**He made him king over**

Ephraim and Benjamin, these tribes, which had not yet been conquered by the Philistines, holding no doubt to the House of Saul.—**And over all (the rest of) Israel**, that is, over all that country which afterwards formed the kingdom of Israel (Then.).

Vers. 10, 11. *Duration of Ishbosheth's reign* over Israel and of David's in Hebron.—**Forty years old was Ishbosheth when he became king over Israel.**—The words: *over Israel* connect themselves with and take up the closing words of ver. 9: "*and over all Israel.*" The following: **and he reigned two years**, might therefore be understood of his reign over all Israel excluding Judah, the words "over Israel" being naturally supplied from the context. Abner, in fact, on account of the wars necessary to conquer from the Philistines at least the three regions mentioned in ver. 9, could only gradually establish Ishbosheth's royal authority, and could not make him king over *all Israel* till after the clearing of those districts. It may well be supposed that this reconquering process took five and a half years. This explanation (Ewald, Bunsen, Keil) sets aside the seeming discrepancy that arises when we compare the statements that Ishbosheth was king two years, and that David reigned in Hebron over Judah seven years and six months; and it yet remains beyond doubt that Ishbosheth's elevation to the throne was nearly synchronous with David's anointment as king over Judah, and his murder (ch. iv.), up to which he was king, with the anointing of David as king over all Israel. Ishbosheth occupied the throne as long as David was king over Judah; but he was only *two years* king *over Israel*, which he could really become only after the gradual expulsion of the Philistines. However, instead of this explanation the reading of Thenius (which, it must be confessed, does some violence to the syntax) commends itself as better: he takes the passage from "but the house of Judah" to the end of ver. 11 as parenthesis, and renders: *and when he had reigned two years* (only the house of Judah followed David, and the time that David was king in Hebron over the house of Judah was seven years and six months), *then went out Abner, etc.* The harmonistic attempt of S. Schmid, Cler. and others who hold that David reigned two years over Judah till the murder of Ishbosheth and then further five and a half years over *Israel* in Hebron till the conquest of Jerusalem, is in direct contradiction with the words (ver. 11): **David reigned over Judah seven years and six months.** Equally untenable is the view that the two years of Ishbosheth's reign were the time of quiet till the outbreak of the war with David, during which Abner played the chief part (Grotius)—for Ishbosheth was king till his murder after Abner's death.—[Wellhausen connects ver. 10 *b* with ver. 9, and throws out 10 *a* as chronologically wrong, and ver. 11 as interrupting the narrative. It seems probable that 10 *a* and 11 are parenthetical chronological statements; but they are not on that account to be rejected; they may be regarded as explanatory insertions by the editor of the book. As to the chronology, there is no objection to be made to ver. 11, which is well supported (1 Kings ii. 11), and the two years of ver. 10 is reasonably explained by Ewald as above stated by Erdmann, or if the numeral be incorrect, this merely leaves doubtful the duration of Ishbosheth's reign (as Saul's in 1 Sam. xiii. 1), and does not invalidate the clause. Exception is, however, specially taken to Ishbosheth's age as here given, forty. The context, it is said, represents him as a youth or child, and moreover, as probably Saul's youngest son, he must have been several years younger than Jonathan, who was the oldest son, and Jonathan seems to have been nearly of the same age with David, about thirty, when he died. To this it may be answered that Ishbosheth need not have been much younger than Jonathan (especially if Saul had more than one wife), that Jonathan may have been twelve years older than David without bar to their friendship, that Jonathan may easily at the age of forty-two have left just one infant child (2 Sam. iv. 4), and that Saul might have been a husband and a father at the age of twenty-one, and, dying a stout warrior at the age of sixty-three, have left a son of forty-two. There is no difficulty in these suppositions single or combined. But if the number forty be incorrect, this does not affect the genuineness of the clause. The editor thought it well to insert here these chronological statements at the beginning of the narrative of the war between the house of Saul and the house of David. It is quite possible, but by no means certain, that the numerals have been lost or corrupted by copyists. See "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

Ver. 12 sq. From ver. 12 on is related how Abner, after actually establishing Ishbosheth as king *over Israel*, begins the conflict against David in order to subject Judah also to Ishbosheth. He could not have undertaken this war, if he had not finished the war against the Philistines for the establishment of Ishbosheth's authority *over Israel*, so that he knew that he was secure on that side. It is to be noted that David had at no time and in no way planned or begun hostilities against Ishbosheth. Rather he was forced into war by the latter through Abner. *From Mahanaim*, where Ishbosheth's headquarters had hitherto been, Abner advanced with his army against David *to Gibeon* (the present Jib in the western part of Benjamin, five miles north of Jerusalem) in order thence to march southward on Hebron to attack David.—[*Bib. Com.: To go out* is a technical phrase for going out to war.—Tr.]

Ver. 13. Though David had no hostile designs against Ishbosheth, he was yet fully prepared against such a foreseen attack.—[Some hold less well that war was already going on between the two princes.—Tr.]—To Ishbosheth's army under *Abner* he opposed a force under *Joab*. *Joab*, the son of David's sister Zeruiah (1 Chron. ii. 16), had no doubt already, as his brother Abishai (who was with David during his persecution, as David's family also, 1 Sam. xxii., came to him for protection against Saul), had a military training with his uncle, and taken a prominent position among his warriors; else he would not now appear as the chief leader of David's forces. In the roll of heroes in ch. xxiii. 8 sq. his name is not given, probably because he already then stood above them all as General, as we may conjecture from xxiii. 18, 24 (Vaihinger in Herzog VI. 712). As General-in-chief he appears in

the official lists, viii. 16; xx. 13.—The two armies met *at the pool of Gibeon*, David having hastened to anticipate Abner's attack on the territory of Judah, and to carry the war into Ishbosheth's territory. The *pool* of Gibeon is the "great water" mentioned in Jer. xli. 12; there is still in Jib (the ancient Gibeon) in a cave a copious spring [forming a large reservoir], and not far beneath [on the side of the hill] the remains of an open tank which Robinson (II. 353 sq. [Am. ed. 455 and ii. 256]) saw, one hundred and twenty feet long and one hundred feet wide, about equal to the pool of Hebron. Comp. Tobler, *Topographie von Jerusalem* II. 515 sq. [and Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, Art. Gibeon.—Tr.]. The armies encamped at this pool opposite one another, **the one on this side, the other on that side.**

Vers. 14–16. To avoid a bloody civil war and perhaps also to escape personal conflict with his near friend (ver. 22) Joab, Abner proposes to Joab to decide the contest by a duel between individual warriors ("young men," נְעָרִים, comp. ver. 21) put up on both sides. This word "play" (שִׂחֵק) is used of children in the street (Zech. viii. 5), of beasts in the sea (Ps. civ. 26), and so here of warlike play, = to wrestle, but not to denote a game of arms for entertainment (Ew.), but a *serious* battle-play to decide the matter for both armies (comp. 1 Sam. xvii.) as the result (ver. 16) shows.—Joab accepts the proposal *immediately*, a sign that it was agreeable to him. Twelve warriors from each side, the number probably derived from the number of the Tribes, meet in single combat on one side of the pool. The "went over" is to be understood of *one* party only, while the preceding **arose** refers to both.—[The "went over" refers from the wording to both parties; probably they met at some intermediate point.—Tr.]—**And they seized every man the head of his fellow**, that is, they rushed on one another, in order by the stunning seizure of the head the more quickly and thoroughly to finish the struggle. It is not necessary (Then. and Ew. after Sept.) to supply "his hand" after "man" ("they thrust each his hand on the head of his opponent") in order to get a verb for "his sword" [Eng. A. V. inserts "thrust"]; there is no need to repeat the verb "seized," for we may without forcing render: **and his** (every one's) **sword in the side of his opponent!** The rapidity with which, at the same time with the seizure of the head, the sword entered the adversary's side is vividly set forth by the absence of the verb, it being logically necessary to supply merely the word "was."—**And they fell together.**—This result shows the embittered feeling of the young men, but also their military skill and training.—[Bp. Patrick understands that only the twelve Benjaminites were slain; but it was clearly a mutual slaughter, the twenty-four fell dead. *Bib. Com.* cites the strikingly similar combat of the Horatii and the Curiatii; as the Alban Mettius there urged the desirableness of avoiding bloodshed because the two people had in the Etruscans a common powerful enemy, so might Abner have here urged the same argument in reference to the Philistines (Livy I. 25).—The hair was often worn long in those days; but it was a custom also to cut the hair (and sometimes the beard) before going into battle, that the enemy might not have a hold thereby.—These single combats still occur among the Arabians.—Tr.]—**The place** (of combat) **was called** (by the people in consequence of this result).—**Field of knives** (or **edges**) (חֶלְקַת הַצֻּרִים). The narrative indicates that this name was connected immediately with what was peculiar in the occurrence, namely, the mutual synchronous slaughter by the edge of the sword, so that they fell down together. To this corresponds the meaning of צוּר, "knife, edge" (comp. Eng. *knife*), which is found also in Ps. lxxxix. 44, and is established from the ground-idea of the Arabic stem by Fleischer in Delitzsch's *Comm. on the Pss. in loco* (2 vols., 1859–60). Thenius after the Sept. (τῶν ἐπιβούλων, "the plotters") renders *field of adversaries* (*drängerfeld*, ח׳ הַצָּרִים); but this does not answer to the characteristic fact that occasioned the name, which was not the mutual attack, but the mutual slaughter with swords. Thenius' objection to the rendering: "field of edges"—that it would apply to every place of combat—holds rather against his own translation. Ewald's rendering: "field of the artful" (צָדִים) unwarrantably introduces the notion of "artifice" into the affair, and changes the Heb. text, which is supported by all the versions. Vulg.: *ager robustorum*, Aq., Sym.: *κλῆρος τῶν στερεῶν*, "field of the strong," a rendering derived from the signification "*rock*" (which also belongs to the Heb. word), as if the rock-like firmness of the combatants (which, however, is not specially mentioned in the narrative) were here indicated.—[Bishop Patrick follows the Vulg. in the translation of this name, Syr., Philippson, *Bib. Com.* (which, however, also suggests "field of sides," צִדִּים) give it as Erdmann. Chald. has "possession of the slain."—Tr.]

Vers. 17–25. *In consequence of the undecisive result of the single combat, a general and fierce battle* between the two armies, which issues in the defeat and flight of Abner. To the bitterness of the bloody duel answers the *violence* of the general conflict that arose the same day, which is described as "very sore" (ver. 17). Its result, in allusion to the single combat, which had *not* proved decisive, is straightway given: Abner and his army were *beaten.*—In vers. 18–23 we have a very vivid and interesting description of a special battle-scene or rather pursuit. In this scene the three nephews of David come forward, Joab, Abishai (comp. 1 Sam. xxvi. 6 with 2 Sam. xvi. 9; xviii. 2; xxi. 17; xxiii. 18) and Asahel, who are expressly described as sons of Zeruiah (as Joab in ver. 13) in order to indicate the prominent part taken in this battle by the *family* of David. Ver. 18. *Asahel*, distinguished for agility and swiftness, and therefore compared to a "gazelle in the field" [Eng. A. V.: wild roe], see Prov. vi. 5.—Ver. 19. He pursues Abner in order by conquering the General to strike the decisive blow that must end the battle.—**He turned not to the right hand nor to the left from following Abner**, pressed hard and straight on him.—Ver. 20. Asahel was doubtless already known to Abner, comp. ver. 22. Abner's speaking supposes that Asahel had almost overtaken him, and might now infer from his silence

that he would surrender himself prisoner.—Ver. 21. Abner's address to Asahel is based on the supposition that the latter is anxious only for the glory of making a prisoner and for booty.—**Take his armor,*** that is, after having slain him.—[Such was the custom; see Homer for example.—Tr.]—Ver. 22. Abner speaks again, since Asahel will not desist from the pursuit. He gives as reason for his exhortation that he wishes to spare Asahel's life, and not, by slaying him, make a deadly enemy of his brother Joab, with whom, therefore, he must previously have stood in friendly relations (Thenius). "From regard and former friendship to Joab, he was unwilling to kill the young hero" (Keil), [who was also "probably but a stripling and no fit antagonist for so great a warrior" (*Bib.-Com.*).—Tr.]—**How should I lift up my face?** that is, *present myself* with a good conscience *before him.* [Bp. Patrick not so well: "because Joab was a fierce man, and would study revenge."—Tr.]—Ver. 23. Asahel, however, did not desist from pressing on Abner, who, not wishing to kill him, was compelled to defend himself, and so, not with the front part of the spear, which was designed for war, but with the hinder part, which was stuck into the ground (1 Sam. xxvi. 7), and therefore no doubt was furnished with a sharp edge (perhaps of metal) **smote him in the abdomen** so that it came out behind in his back, and he fell dead on the spot. It hence appears that Asahel pressed violently on Abner, who was defending himself with the point of the spear, which must have been very sharp. In proof that there was a *lower* metallic point to spears, Böttcher cites *Hom. Il.* vi. 213; x. 153; xiii. 443; Herod. vii. 41.—[On the translation "abdomen" instead of "fifth rib," see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.] This place, too, where Asahel fell, received importance among the people from the general mourning over the young hero. This is pathetically and vividly described by the single expression: "Every one that came to the place stood still," comp. xx. 12.—Ver. 24. The pursuit continues with all the more violence. The two brothers *Joab* and *Abishai* follow Abner till the *evening.* At the same time the *locality* (now unknown) where the pursuit ended, "the hill Ammah in front of Giah on the road to the wilderness of Gibeon," is stated with precision; an evidence of the exactness of the narrative. The wilderness of Gibeon lay east of Gibeon in the tribe of Benjamin.—Ver. 25. The "*children of Benjamin,*" as the nearest tribesmen, who must have been most interested for the kingdom of Ishbosheth. **They gathered themselves together** from the dispersion produced by flight **into one body** after Abner **on a hill**, that is, to protect Abner, and from this more favorable position to defend themselves.—[*Bib.-Com.:* Abner's skill and courage in rallying his followers to a strong position in spite of so crushing a defeat. On the text of vers. 24, 25, see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

Vers. 26–28. On *Abner's appeal to Joab* the conflict is straightway stopped, and the pursuit on Joab's part ceases. A *truce is concluded.* Abner's first word: **Shall the sword devour forever?** expresses decided aversion to this bloody combat. The second question: **Knowest thou not that it will be bitterness at last?** points not to outward destruction, but to the empoisoning and brutalizing (the necessary result at last of such a war) of the feeling that the members of a people, and especially God's covenant-people, ought to cherish towards one another. Just at this moment the bitterness had reached its highest point, and the result of the continuation of the war would necessarily have been bitter and sullen despair on the part of the Benjaminites and an increase of military fury in the army of Judah. Vulg.: "Dost thou not know how dangerous is desperation?" The third question is a pressing demand to Joab to suspend hostilities immediately and agree to a truce. Joab answers Abner with an oath, in which he partly charges him with the blame of the day's bloody struggle, partly affirms his own perfect willingness to cease hostilities without following up his victory. The first כִּי = "surely" (*imo*), the mark of emphatic asseveration in an oath, Ew. § 330 *b;* comp. 1 Sam. xiv. 44; xx. 3; Gen. xxii. 16 sq.; 1 Ki. i. 29 sq.; ii. 23 sq., where, as here, it follows real oaths and introduces their contents. [This first "surely" is not in the Eng. A. V.—Tr.] **If thou hadst not said this, surely then.**—The second "surely" (כִּי), strengthened by "then" (אָז) as elsewhere by "now" (עַתָּה), Num. xxii. 29; Gen. xliii. 10; 1 Sam. xiv. 30, takes up the first in order to bring out more expressly and strongly what would then have happened. What *Abner said* is his proposition for the single combat (ver. 14), which resulted in this obstinate battle. **Yea verily, then had the people gone up**—that is, returned (Niph. of עָלָה in reflexive sense "get up," Ew. § 123 *b*). There would then have been no fraternal war. Thenius (after Syr. and Ar.) explains: If thou hadst not (now) spoken (about a truce), then surely in the morning, (namely to-morrow) would the people have been led back. But 1) The "*to-morrow*" is not in the Hebrew, and 2) Joab's answer would then amount to nothing, as it was then evening, and a return on the *next* morning was a matter of course. To our interpretation Thenius objects that Abner's proposal of a duel was meant for good, and the two armies had originally marched out with intention to fight; but this objection is of no force against that interpretation, which follows the original word for word, for Joab means to say simply: if thou hadst not by that challenge given the signal for the battle, which, as a matter of fact, continued the whole day, then early in the morning one side would have retreated before the other, and the battle would not have occurred. Joab herein assumes that *Abner*, with the disposition which he has just expressed, would have avoided the battle if he had not excited it by his well-meant arrangement of the duel, and in his whole address and his bearing to Abner it may be seen that *he*

---

* חֲלִצָתוֹ, not *exuvias*, "spoil" [so margin of Eng. A. V. and *Bib.-Com.*—Tr.], from חָלַץ, "to strip off," since then the suffix would be meaningless, but *Armor* from חָלַץ, "to gird" (from חָלָץ, "loins"), Niph.: "to arm one's self for battle," Num. xxxii. 21, 27, 29 sq.; Josh. vi. 7 sq.; Isa. xv. 4; comp. with Jer. xlviii. 41.—Sept.: *πανοπλία αὐτοῦ.*

(Joab) would not have made the attack, and that his march against Abner was simply to protect the territory of Judah. We must read between the lines: but for thine unfortunate word, which has had such results, we twoshould have avoided the battle. Here is to be noted what is indicated in ver. 12 as to the personal relation of Abner to Joab, and how afterwards (chap. iii.) Abner passed from "the House of Saul" to David's side. [Vulg., Lightfoot, Patrick, Philippson agree with Erdmann in the interpretation of this clause—*Bib. Comm.* with Thenius. A common explanation is: even if thou hadst not spoken (for a truce), the pursuit would have ceased to-morrow morning. This answer would not (as Erdmann declares) be meaningless, for it was by no means otherwise certain that the battle would not have been continued the next day. Moreover the phrase "from the morning" might be understood of the following morning. Two facts seem to favor this latter interpretation: 1) the phrase "from after their brethren," repeated by Joab after Abner, would naturally have the same meaning in both cases, "desist from pursuit;" 2) the form in which Joab couches his answer, that is, an oath, better refers to something which lay in his power, not the non-occurrence of a battle that day, but the cessation of the battle going on. Joab would then say (agreeably to the context): I did not design to continue the battle, but, if you had said nothing, my purpose was to withdraw my troops in the morning—the context showing (as in Ex. xxix. 34) that the following morning was meant.—Tr.] Ver. 28. Joab *straightway* causes the trumpet to sound the signal "Halt! Arms at rest!" The army halts, the pursuit is discontinued, the battle is ended.

Vers. 29–32. *The withdrawal of both armies* from the scene of battle, and *the loss* on both sides.—Ver. 29. Abner and his men marched through the *Arabah** (that is, the valley or plain of the Jordan) from the south northward, having marched from the battle-field first directly eastward towards Jericho. The distance from the entrance into the Jordan-plain (to reach which point, however (vers. 3, 4), cost them some hours) up to the point where they crossed the Jordan to go to *Mahanaim*, was so great that it took them at least *the whole night* to pass through the Arabah. They marched "the whole night," not from fear of pursuit (for the pursuit was discontinued and a truce concluded), but probably to avoid the heat of the day. After crossing the Jordan they traversed "*all the Bithron.*" The word "all" forbids us to understand here a *city*—it is therefore not *Bethoron* (Aq., Vulg.), apart from the fact that this lay in the opposite direction north-west of Gibeon—but it must mean a *district* beyond the Jordan, probably a mountain-gorge or a plain on the Jabbok between the Jordan and Mahanaim, which lay on the Jabbok. These specific geographical statements also about Abner's return-march show the historical exactness and value of the narrative.—Ver. 30. At the same time Joab began his return-march "from after Abner (who was withdrawing)," as it is vividly described. Not till the whole force was *assembled* for the return was a muster held in order to learn the *loss*. Only nineteen men and Asahel were missing from David's army. [Among these nineteen some reckon the twelve that fell in the single combat.—Tr.]—Ver. 31. The Benjaminite loss, on the other hand, was much greater, "360 men dead," as might easily be determined by counting the slain. Joab had in his army only veteran "servants of David," tried by many severe battles and privations, while Abner led into the battle the remains of the army that was beaten by the Philistines at Gilboa, who moreover in previous battles with that people "might have been still more weakened and discouraged" (Keil). The disproportion in the losses "may, however, have been due also in part to the character of the ground," comp. ver. 25 (Then.). [On the apparently corrupt text of this verse see "Text. and Gramm."—Tr.]—Ver. 31. *Asahel is buried* on the march back in the burial-place of his father at Bethlehem, which lay only a little to the left of the direct road to Hebron. "They went the whole night thence," and came at break of day *to Hebron*. Gibeon is distant from Hebron about 26 miles; they might therefore have gone from Gibeon to Hebron in one night, even if they stopped on the way to bury Asahel, which need not have taken much time (against Then.). [However, the text says only that they went all night from Bethlehem to Hebron, fifteen miles. They had previously marched from near Gibeon to Bethlehem, after having attended to the duties incident to the close of a battle.—Tr.]

Chap. iii. 1–6. *Further general and summary account of the long duration of the conflict between the houses of David and Saul and their different fortunes.*—Ver. 1. **And the war was protracted between the house of Saul and the house of David.**—The former stands first because the attack came from it. From the account of the particular incident at Gibeon, where the contest assumed the form of open war, which was suddenly ended by the two generals, the narrator turns to the summary description of the *condition* in which the two houses from now on found themselves *in respect to the contest*, notwithstanding the discontinuance of external war. While this long-continued struggle lasted, outward hostilities were not renewed [at least there were no pitched battles—Tr.], Ishbosheth lacking courage and energy therefor, Abner, as his bearing (chap. ii.) towards Joab showed, having no special interest in continuing the bloody strife, and David, as before, so now holding back from attack, since, though he had power and courage to maintain his claims, he yet hoped to gain his promised royal authority over Israel, not by his own military power, but only by the interposition of the Lord. Further is related *the fortune of the two houses* during the long contest.* **David grew stronger and stronger.**†—David's advance in strength means, however, not the increase of his family (Keil), but of

* [On the Arabah (which is in general the deep gorge of the Jordan, extending from the sea of Kinnereth (Gennesaret) to the Gulf of Akabah), see Smith's *Bible Dict. s. v.* and Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, 481.—Tr.]

* הָלַךְ with Vb. or Adj. (1 Sam. ii. 26) indicating progressive increase. Ges. §131, 3, Rem. 3.

† חָזֵק is not—חָזָק "strong" (Böttcher on Ex. xix. 19), but Partcp. or Verbal Adj.—"strengthening" (neuter), as גָּדֵל (1 Sam. ii. 26).

his adherents, of the number of those that recognized him as king over all Israel, and came forward as supporters of his authority over the whole country, as is fully and clearly narrated in 1 Chr. xii. 23 sq. On the other hand **the house of Saul grew weaker and weaker** in consideration and power. The reason of this was Ishbosheth's incapacity for royal rule and Abner's afterwards related defection from the house of Saul. During the time of struggle he was the only person that sought still to maintain this house (ver. 6), and it rapidly sank and disappeared when he went over to David. Ver. 1 and ver. 6 are therefore connected; ver. 1, according to this view, not only continues the preceding chapter (Then.), but at the same time begins a new section (vers. 1–6) which forms a *transition* to the narrative from ver. 7 on, in which is related how David's elevation to the throne of all Israel was prepared by the sinking and disappearance of the house of Saul under his last son.—*The statement* (vers. 2–5) *concerning David's family* during his residence in Hebron, and the sons there born to him certainly interrupts the progress of the narrative (Then.); for it is not to be connected with ver. 1 as being a factual proof of the strengthening of David's house (Keil). But it is quite in place here, since it is in keeping with the habit [of the biblical writers] of inserting at the beginning or at a turning-point of the history of the reign of each king, information about his house and family. Comp. 1 Sam. xiv. 49–51; 2 Sam. v. 13 sq.; 1 Ki. iii. 1; xiv. 21; xv. 2, 9. The same list of the sons born in Hebron, with the names of their mothers, is found in 1 Chr. iii. 1–3. The two first are the sons of the two wives Ahinoam and Abigail (1 Sam. xxv. 42 sq.), whom he brought with him to Hebron. On Amnon see chap. xiii. The Prep. "to" (so the Heb. לְ) in these cases, where a corresponding noun is to be supplied, expresses immediate belonging [property], as "a song of (לְ) David;" so here "son to (or of, Germ. *von*) Ahinoam," comp. Ewald, § 292 *a*.—Ver. 3. The second son is called *Chileab*, in Chron. *Daniel;* he had perhaps two names (Keil). [The name Chileab is suspected by Wellhausen to be a collateral form of Caleb (see the two in the Heb.), while *Bib. Comm.* thinks it a copyist's erroneous transcription of the first letters of the following word. The Midrash derives it from כלה אב = "exactly his father," the name indicating his likeness to David against those who said that he was the son of Nabal. Similarly the name Daniel, "God has judged me," is said to refer to God's judgment on Nabal. These are all conjectures, and the relation of the two names is involved in obscurity.—Tr.] The *third*, Absalom (called in 1 Ki. xv. 2 Abishalom), son of Maachah, daughter of king Talmai of Geshur. This was a small independent kingdom in *Syria*. See xv. 8, comp. ii. 9. Perhaps this marriage of David with a foreign un-Israelitish princess had a political ground. Comp. 1 Ki. iii. 1, Solomon's marriage with a daughter of Pharaoh. The origin of the three wives, *Haggith*, *Abital*, and *Eglah*, whose sons were *Adonijah*, *Shephatiah*, and *Ithream*, is not given. The last is strangely described in an especial way as "David's wife." Bertheau (on 1 Chr. iii. 3) holds that the unknown and undescribed Eglah is so called for the sake of a fuller conclusion; but Thenius justly remarks against this *reason* that Haggith and Abital also are otherwise wholly unknown. Thenius' suggestion that *Michal* originally stood in the text is opposed by the fact that with the exception of the Cod. Vat., which has *Aigal*, the correctness of the text-reading is supported by all the witnesses. Probably this in itself superfluous addition is made in order to give a fuller conclusion by this epithet which suits each of the six women (Berth., Keil). [On this reading see "Text. and Gramm.—Tr.]—Ver. 6 resumes ver. 1 in relation to the *continuance of the conflict* between the two houses, and the statement: **Abner showed himself strong** (=a strong support) **for the house of Saul**, concludes the period during which the house of Saul was able through Abner to maintain itself against the house of David. In contrast therewith follows now the narrative of the events which, in consequence of Abner's ceasing to work for it, through Ishbosheth's unwise conduct, farther and farther depressed the house of Saul; comp. ver. 1 *b*. So vers. 1–6 form the bridge to the following history (from ver. 7 on).

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. David's personality, bearing and doing after Saul's death, and the consequent turn of his life towards the fulfilment of his call to the theocratic kingdom, show in all points, as here detailed in the prophetic narrative, absolutely free, trustful and humble dependence on the will of God, as it has up to this time shown itself as the foundation of David's life-development, and a determination of conduct solely by the carefully sought, distinctly apprehended and clearly recognized divine decision, as it had before been obtained by him at many important and difficult moments (1 Sam. xix. 19; xxii. 5; xxiii. 2, 4, 10, 16; xxx. 8). That this was accomplished here also through the Urim and Thummim is not doubtful; for the high-priest with the ephod was with him, while nothing is said of a prophet in his retinue, apart from the fact that the expression "he inquired of the Lord" cannot be applied to a prophet; it cannot, therefore, be supposed that David received a declaration from a prophet.

2. David's pathway from Ziklag to Hebron, till he gained the crown of Judah, and thence passed to that of Israel, is *the way of the Lord*. For 1) **he asks** concerning the will of *the Lord, which way* he shall go (ver. 1), humbly subjecting his *will* to that of the Lord, in his *heart* relying firmly on the Lord's decision, which could be only for his good, and seeking by repetition of his question to obtain a clear and secure *knowledge* of the way he is to go. 2) **He goes** *the way appointed him by the Lord* (vers. 2, 3) in unconditional *obedience* towards His command, in the *faithful discharge of his duties* towards all about him, who had hitherto shared all sufferings with him, and in joyous reliance on the further help of the Lord. 3) **He finds** *in this way appointed by the Lord* after the cross the crown, and mounts up from lowliness to glory (ver. 4). 4) **He pauses** on this way, which has led him to royal honor, in order quietly to wait in *patience* till the Lord direct him to go

forward to the final goal, the kingdom over all Israel, and in order to unfold the noble *royal virtues* in which he proves himself the Anointed of the Lord (vers. 5–7). 5) **He advances** *on the same way* according to the Lord's direction to *ward off* the attack of the adversary (vers. 8–13), to bloody *war*, into which he is drawn against his will (vers. 14–23), to splendid *victory* over his opponents (vers. 25–32), and to the attainment of increasing *power* and *glory* in respect to the sinking house of Saul.

3. *Grace* (חֶסֶד) and *Truth* (אֱמֶת) are the fundamental attributes of God, which set forth His relation to the people of Israel as the covenant-people; *grace* is the special exhibition of His love, by which He 1) chooses the people, 2) establishes the covenant with them, and 3) in this covenant-relation imparts favor and salvation; *truth* is God's love unchangeable and continuing over against the people's sin, love that 1) does not suffer the choice of free grace to fall, 2) maintains the covenant, and 3) fulfils uncurtailed the promises that correspond to the covenant-relation. Comp. Ex. xxxiv. 6; Ps. xxv. 10.

4. *Every human work well-pleasing to God, wrought out of genuine love and truth, is a reflection of God's love and truth*, of which the heart has had experience, *an offering brought to the Lord*, the impulsion to which has come from this inwardly experienced love and truth, *an object of God's love and truth which repays with blessing and salvation, and of men's honoring recognition* in respect to its ethical value.

5. *Invocation of the Lord's blessing* (ver. 5) presupposes the presence of *the conditions* under which alone this blessing can subsist.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1 sq. *Faith's inquiry of the Lord.* 1) *Whereon it is founded; a*) Upon an entire looking away from human prudence and wisdom; *b*) Upon unconditional trust in the divine love and faithfulness, and *c*) Upon previous experiences of His gracious help. 2) *What sort of answer it finds; a*) A certain decision, which puts an end to all doubt; *b*) A definite direction which way to go; *c*) A safe security that this way leads to the goal.

Vers. 1–4 *a*. From *Ziklag* to *Hebron—the way of humility from the depths to the heights.* 1) After humble *subjection* to sore trials, which the Lord had imposed ("after this," ver. 1). 2) After humble *inquiry* of the Lord's will as to the way he must further go. 3) In humble submission to be *directed and guided* by the Lord in the way appointed for him. 4) In humble and patient *expectation* of the fulfilment of His promises.

The way of faith through cross to crown. 1) How it is surely *found* (ver. 11), *a*) *inquired for* of the Lord; *b*) *pointed out* by the Lord. 2) How it is confidently *pursued*, *a*) under the *guidance* of the Lord's hand; *b*) in *communion* with those united in the Lord (vers. 2, 3). 3) How it is joyfully *completed*, *a*) at the *goal* set up by the Lord; *b*) under the direction of faithful human love, the instrument of the Lord's love (ver. 4).

Vers. 4 *b*–7. *Faithful love to our neighbor in time of need.* 1) How it is in a noble and unselfish manner *shown and attested* amid the misfortune of our neighbor (ver. 4 *b*). 2) How it is *blessed* by *God* in the manifestation of His grace and the attestation of His faithfulness (vers. 5, 6). 3) How it is *honored* by *men* through thankful recognition and righteous requital (ver. 6). 4) How it is *exalted* in itself to a stout *heart* and to great *joy* (ver. 7).

[Ver. 6. "And now the Lord do kindness (grace) and truth unto you." See points for the homiletical discussion of this text in "Hist. and Theol." No. 3.—Vers. 1–13. See outline of a sermon in "Hist. and Theol." No. 2.—Tr.]

Vers. 8–32. *God's judgment in war:* I. How the divine decision *falls:* 1) *Against* him who has *begun the war unrighteously*, *a*) to fight out a pretended right; *b*) to extend an assumed power and dominion; *c*) in conscious resistance to God's right and command. 2) *For* him who has been *innocently drawn into* it, *a*) to repel injustice; *b*) to defend His righteous cause; *c*) to uphold God's command and righteousness. II. How men should *submit* to this divine decision: 1) The *conquered* have to bow in humility under God's hand, and to abandon the war, *a*) in order to avoid further bloodshed; *b*) to ward off further mischief; *c*) to preserve the people from spiritually and morally running wild. 2) The *conquerors* must, *a*) in the course of victory and honor stop immediately with self-denial when the Lord commands it; *b*) give the conquered the hand of peace when they ask a cessation of hostilities on the ground of the divine decision which has been reached, and *c*) testify to the readiness for peace which *they* have felt, and against the unrighteousness which has constrained them to the conflict.

Chap. iii. 1–6. *By justice divine are decided All conflicts that men have divided.* 1) What comes from God, alone can last; 2) What stands against God, soon is past.*

Ver. 1. Cramer: When the righteous are oppressed and have stood the test, God leads them by a right way that they may go to a city of habitation, Ps. cvii. 7; so let us wait patiently for the right time, Heb. ii. 3; Ps. lv. 22. Osiander: A Christian should never undertake anything without good forethought and effort to learn God's will from His word, and should often seek to strengthen his faith therefrom, Ps. cxix. 105.—Berl. B.: David rests not in all the illuminations and promises he has before received, but only in the will of God, and looks to the divine nod and glance, the truest and only guide for tranquilly trusting souls. Thereby the soul remains free in all things from selfishness and vain joy. [Henry: He doubted not of success, yet he uses proper means, both divine and human. Assurance of hope in God's promise will be so far from slackening, that it will quicken pious endeavors.—Tr.].—Ver. 3. Cramer: Faithful friends, proven in time of need, are a great treasure. Starke: When God gives us prosperity, we should cause this also to be shared by those who have shared with us in distress. [Hall: Thus doth our heavenly leader, whom David prefigured, take us to reign with Him who have suffered with Him.—Tr.].—Ver. 4. Osiander: The hearts of subjects are in God's hand, and God can incline them so that they must love their rulers. What God has promised is sure to come at last. After enduring sufferings thou shalt re-

* [This rhyming in propositions and divisions is a somewhat common practice in Germany.—Tr.]

ceive the crown of life, 2 Tim. iv. 8.—S. SCHMID: Praiseworthy deeds always get their praise and their reward even among men, although they are not performed to that end, but from love to righteousness.—Ver. 6. CRAMER: By gentleness and friendliness rulers may easily win the hearts of their subjects, and also quiet much contention, Judg. viii. 2.—Ver. 7. J. LANGE: Kings derive their kingly majesty immediately from God, but also mediately from their subjects.—F. W. KRUMMACHER: People gained here the conviction that this man, unmoved by the lower affections of revenge and malice, knew how to forgive and to forget, and that all the wrong and injustice he had experienced had not been able to darken for him in his predecessor the dignity and sacredness of an Anointed of the Lord. Besides, this conduct of David's made on the people the decided impression that they might expect of him a humane rule, since he would reckon even the most trifling and insignificant praiseworthy thing that might happen anywhere in the land to be worthy of grateful recognition and consideration.

Vers. 8, 9. CRAMER: The whole life of pious men is and remains a continual school of the cross. In them holds good the saying: Must not man be always in strife on earth? Job vii. 1. [So LUTHER. Similarly CONANT: Has not man a term of warfare on the earth?—TR.].—S. SCHMID: Carnal prudence and pride is never willing to submit itself to God's will, but will always oppose itself, Exod. v. 2.=Ver. 10. SCHLIER: He wore the crown that had been promised him, but the cross also did not yet cease for him. Still he must persevere and wait till the whole kingdom fell to him, still he must now also bear patiently whatever new burden was allotted to him.—BERL B.: When he came into possession of his kingdom, even yet he remained quiet awhile, without considering how he might increase it, because he cast all this care upon Divine Providence. He thus shames the behaviour of those spiritual men, who when they recognize that God wishes to do something through them, are constantly making attempts and all sorts of beginnings to see whether they may perhaps achieve the work, and are never willing in patience and self-forgetfulness to wait on God, until God Himself performs His will. The hour must come itself, and so it must simply be waited for.

Ver. 12. STARKE: A Christian must not let his courage sink because when he has gained a victory in a good cause, unexpectedly new obstacles and hindrances are found.—SCHLIER: When a king takes the sword in an ambitious spirit, and wishes only to subjugate other peoples in order to extend his dominion, that is an unrighteous war, and woe to all the princes who in base ambition set at stake the blood of their people!—A bad prince, who wilfully conjures up war upon his land. But also shame upon the prince who would not help his people when wrong is done them. A righteous war is a royal duty, from which no prince can venture to withdraw, even if it were fraternal war! It may have come hard enough to David to take up arms against his brothers, and yet he could not do otherwise. God the Lord had Himself given the arms into his hand.—Vers. 13-32. CRAMER: Bloodthirsty warriors count men's blood as water, and have their pastime in it, but to God that is an abomination. SCHLIER: In such times there is only one consolation, namely, that the Lord sits as ruler, and that we should accept the war, if there is one, from the hand of the supreme Lord of war, that we should not regard what princes and kings of the earth do and design, but see in war the chastening rod of divine wrath, which visits the sins of the peoples even through the horrors of war.—Vers. 18, 19. CRAMER: Let no one rely on the powers of his body, for the race is not to the swift, Eccl. ix. 11.—Ver. 23. LANGE: Bravery is certainly very far different from foolhardy temerity. [HALL: Many a one miscarries in the rash prosecution of a good quarrel, when the abettors of the worst part go away with victory. Heat of zeal, sometimes in the indiscreet pursuit of a just adversary, proves mortal to the agent, prejudicial to the service. HENRY: See here (1) How often death comes upon us by ways that we least suspect. Who would fear the hand of a flying enemy, or the butt end of a spear? (2) How we are often betrayed by the accomplishments we are proud of. Asahel's swiftness, which he presumed so much upon, did him no kindness, but forwarded his fate.—TR.]

Ver. 24 sq. SCHLIER: The bloodshed was at an end, the horrors of fraternal war were over, the victory had been won by David, who had begun the war in the name of the Lord, and now from the Lord had also received the victory. For of this we should be certain: victory comes from the Lord. As surely as the Lord our God is no dead but a living God—as surely as He sits in government and orders everything as the Almighty God, so surely must it also be true that victory comes from the Lord, Ps. xx. 8.—Vers. 24-26. CRAMER: A wretched wisdom when one grows prudent only with losses. Therefore in the beginning think of the end. [HENRY: See here (1) How easy it is for men to use reason when it makes for them, who would not use it if it made against them! (2) How the issue of things alters men's minds! The same things which looked pleasant in the morning, at night looked dismal.—TR.].—Ver. 27. It is an honor to a man to stay out of contention; but they who love it are altogether fools, Prov. xx. 3.—Ver. 28. STARKE: Even he who has been injured by another should show himself ready to be reconciled to the other if he desires forgiveness, Matt. v. 5.—Vers. 30, 31. CRAMER: Prosperity should be used reverently and with moderation, lest we fly too high.—God punishes in war the sins of both parties.—Ch. iii. 1 sq. ROOS: What is not devised, done, collected and set up in God's name, has no permanence. God in His holy wrath is the fire that consumes such a thing, however specious it seems; on the contrary, what He wills and approves, is through His good pleasure obtained, advanced and made strong.

[Ver. 11. *David at Hebron:* 1) His choosing the place by divine direction (ver. 1). And we can see that it was a fit place. The city of Abraham, Caleb and the Levites—a city of refuge—the principal town in David's tribe, and somewhat remote from Saul's tribe—and David had taken pains to conciliate its inhabitants (1 Sam. xxx. 31). Divine directions are seen to coincide with true human wisdom, wherever we sufficiently understand the facts. 2) His "apprenticeship to monarchy." Through several previous years he

had been in a course of providential preparation for reigning; and now he begins to reign on a small scale. He has occasion to learn *a*) from the apparent failure of wild schemes (ver. 5 sqq.), *b*) from open hostility, long continued (ver. 12 sqq.; iii. 1), *c*) from the base cruelty of his trusted commander (iii. 27). Amid all these he grew in popularity and strength (iii. 1, 36). The lessons he learned were especially, to be prudent (ver. 5 sqq.; iii. 28), and to be patient (ver. 11; iii. 1). 3) His founding a family, (iii. 2–5). *a*) To have *sons* born to him is the joy of any man, especially of a monarch. *b*) But here *polygamy* was already paving the way to sore family dissension. *c*) And three of these sons born at Hebron, Amnon, Absalom, Adonijah, were destined to bring wretchedness and shame on their father and his house, and ruin on themselves. O the mingled hopes and fears with which a father must look on his little children!—Tr.]

[*A Sunday-school address.* Vers. 18–23. *The rash young prince.* 1) He had a shining gift, ver. 18. (In ancient warfare, more were often slain in the pursuit than the battle; and so swiftness of foot was important to a warrior). 2) He was ambitious—pursuing the distinguished general of the enemy. 3) He had decision and perseverance—turning not to the right or left, and yielding to persuasion. 4) He fancied himself superior to an old man—a common and natural, but grave fault in the young. (The old man at length killed him with ease, in mere self-defense). 5) He was slain as the penalty of self-confidence and rashness—besetting sins of many gifted youth.—Tr.]

III. *Abner's quarrel with Ishbosheth, defection from the House of Saul and transition to David.*

Chapter III. 7–21.

7 And Saul had a concubine whose name was Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah, and
Ishbosheth[1] said to Abner, Wherefore hast thou gone in unto my father's concubine?[2]
8 Then was Abner [And Abner was] very wroth for the words of Ishbosheth, and
said, Am I a dog's head which against Judah[3] [a dog's head on Judah's side?] [*ins.*
I] do show kindness this day [to-day] unto the house of Saul thy father, to his bre-
thren and to his friends, and have not delivered thee into the hand of David, that
9 [and] thou chargest me to-day with a fault concerning this [the] woman? [!] So
do God to Abner and more also except, as the Lord [Jehovah] hath sworn to Da-
10 vid, even so I do to him, To translate the kingdom from the house of Saul, and to
set up the throne of David over Israel and over Judah, from Dan even to Beersheba.
11 And he could not answer Abner a word again, because he feared him.
12 And Abner sent messengers to David on his behalf [*or* in his stead[4]], saying,
Whose is the land?[5] saying *also* [*om.* also], Make thy league [covenant] with me,

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 7. The lacking subject "Ishbosheth" is supplied in 5 MSS., some printed EDD., and all the VSS. except Chald.; but this shows only that they regarded this name as the proper subject, not that it was originally in the text. Whether it stood originally in our Heb., or we have here a fragment of a fuller narrative in which the subject of the verb was indicated by the context, cannot now be determined.—Before "to his brethren," in ver. 8, the copula "and" is inserted in all VSS. except Chald., and in some MSS.—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 7. In פִּילֶגֶשׁ the quiescent Jod instead of dagh. forte (as is frequent in Chald.). The origin of the word is unknown; comp. Chald. פַּלְגִּיסָא "vigorous beast," perhaps "one that has reached years of puberty," (Levy); but comp. Arab. *falhas* and *ufud*.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 8. This rendering of Eng. A. V., taken from the Vulg., cannot be well gotten from the Heb.; the translation in brackets is the one now generally adopted.—Instead of הִמְצֵיתִי (for הִמְצֵאתִי) "delivered," Syr. has שׁלם and Sept. has ηὐτομόλησα — הִשְׁלַמְתִּי (Then.).—The change of Prep. after חֶסֶד (עִם and אֶל) is to be noted.—Symmachus renders "dog's head" by κυνοκέφαλος "dog-headed."—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 12. תַּחְתּוֹ, Qeri תַּחְתָּיו. Two general renderings of this phrase are found in the Ancient VSS.: "in his place" (Sym.: "instead of him," Vulg., *pro se dicentes*, Chald., "from his place," Syr. omits it) and "on the spot" (Sept. παραχρῆμα, followed by Erdmann). The former best accords with the usage, and gives a good sense.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 12. The difficulties in this text are 1) the double לֵאמֹר "saying;" 2) the absence of the Art. before אֶרֶץ "land;" 3) the obscurity of this question. The Heb. text is supported by the VSS., except that the second לֵאמֹר is omitted in Syr., Arab., and in a few MSS., and the second in Sept., and the Sept. text of the question is corrupt (the Vat. Sept. shows an imperfect triplet: Abner sent messengers to David εἰς Θαιλάμ οὗ ἦν παραχρῆμα,

and behold, my hand shall be with thee to bring about [to turn] all Israel unto
13 thee. And he[6] said, Well; I will make a league [covenant] with thee; but one
thing I require of thee, that is, Thou shalt not see my face except[7] thou first[7] [*om.*
14 first] bring Michal, Saul's daughter, when thou comest to see my face. And David
sent messengers to Ishbosheth, Saul's son, saying, Deliver [Give] *me*[8] my wife Mi-
15 chal, which [whom] I espoused to me for an hundred foreskins of the Philistines.
And Ishbosheth sent and took her from *her* husband, *even* from Phaltiel the son of
16 Laish.[9] And her husband went with her along weeping behind her to Bahurim.
Then said Abner [And Abner said] unto him, Go, return. And he returned.
17 And Abner had communication with the elders of Israel, saying, Ye sought for
18 David in times past[10] to be king over you; Now, then, do it; for the Lord [Jeho-
vah] hath spoken of[11] David, saying, By the hand of my servant David I will[12]
save my people Israel out of the hand of the Philistines and out of the hand of all
19 their enemies. And Abner also[13] spake in the ears of Benjamin; and Abner went
also[13] to speak in the ears of David in Hebron all that seemed good to Israel and
that seemed good [*om.* that seemed good] to the whole house of Benjamin. So [And]
20 Abner came to[14] David to Hebron and twenty men with him. And David made
21 Abner and the men that were with him a feast. And Abner said unto David, I
will arise and go, and will gather all Israel unto my lord the king, that they[15] may
make a league [covenant] with thee, and that thou mayest reign over all that thine
heart desireth. And David sent Abner away, and he went in peace.

IV. *Murder of Abner by Joab.* Vers. 22–39.

22 And behold the servants of David and Joab came from *pursuing* a troop [came
from an expedition[16]], and brought in a great spoil with them. But [And] Abner
was not with David in Hebron, for he had sent him away and he was gone in peace.
23 When Joab and all the host that was with him were come, they told Joab, saying,
Abner the son of Ner came to the king, and he hath sent him away, and he is gone
24 in peace. Then Joab came to the king and said, What hast thou done? behold,
Abner came unto thee; why is it that thou hast sent him away, and he is quite [*om.*

in which θαιλάμ seems to be corrupted out of תחתו למי, οὗ ἦν is for οὗ γῆν, while παραχρῆμα is translation of תחתי). It appears that the question and the second לאמר were not understood; Chald.: saying, I swear to him who made the land, saying—Syr.: what is the land?—The best course seems to be to omit the second לֵאמֹר, and seek a meaning in the question.—Tr.]

6 [Ver. 13. Some VSS. and MSS. have "David," which is merely the expression of the obvious subject.—Tr.]

7 [Ver. 13. As the Heb. stands it can only be rendered "except on condition of thy bringing," (so *Bib. Com.* and substantially Erdmann); Böttcher's suggested readings לִפְנֵי "before" (adv.) and לְפָנַי "before me," are dropped by himself as unnatural here. He and Wellhausen see a duplet in this text (כִּי אִם and לִפְנֵי), which is not improbable, but not necessary. If, in that case, the latter be adopted, the Inf. of the text is retained; if the former, the Perf. must be read.—Tr.]

8 [Ver. 14. There is no need of inserting this Dat. in the Heb. text, since it is easily supplied from the context, and its omission is in accordance with Heb. usage. But in ver. 15 the suffix must be written אִישָׁהּ "her husband."—Tr.]

9 [Ver. 15. Such is the form in the Qeri or margin; the Kethib or text has Lush, which perhaps means the same thing "lion." Apparently by inversion the Sept. writes the name Selle.—Tr.]

10 [Ver. 17. Literally, "both yesterday and the day before."—Tr.]

11 [Ver. 18. אֶל—so Sept., Syr., Arab., Keil, Cahen; but Vulg., Philippson, Erdmann "to David." Thenius would read עַל "concerning" (as the context requires) on the ground that אל cannot so be rendered; but see Jer. xxii. 18.—Tr.]

12 [Ver. 18. The text has the Inf., which after אָמַר some would render "Jehovah said to save" — "said that He would save," but this is hard on account of the intervening לֵאמֹר, and the Impf. is now generally read with many MSS. and printed EDD., and all the Ancient VSS.—Tr.]

13 [Ver. 19. The גַּם "also" qualifies not the succeeding word "Abner," but the preceding "spoke," "went" (Wellh.).—Tr.]

14 [Ver. 20. The Heb. has no Prep. here, employing the Acc. of the point reached; but some MSS. and EDD. insert בְּ, and so all VSS. except Chald., which has לְ.—Tr.]

15 [Ver. 21. The Sept. has the first person, "I will make a covenant with him," which is against the syntax of the context.—Tr.]

16 [Ver. 22. Lit. "from the troop (or predatory band)," so the VSS. except Aquila, who has "Geddur" (גדוּר) which he renders μονοζώνου or εὐζώνου. The Heb. expression is somewhat hard and obscure, but may have been a technical one.—The Heb. Perfects are here from the connection properly rendered by Eng. Plups. "had sent," "was gone."—Tr.]

25 quite[17]] gone? Thou knowest Abner the son of Ner[18] that he came to deceive thee,
and to know thy going out and thy coming in, and to know all that thou doest.
26 And when [*om.* when] Joab was come out [went out] from David he [and] sent
messengers after Abner, which [who] brought him again from the well of Sirah;
but David knew it not.
27 And when Abner was returned to Hebron, Joab took him aside in [to the middle
of] the gate to speak with him quietly, and smote him there under the fifth *rib*
28 [in[19] the abdomen] that he died, for the blood of Asahel his brother. And afterward
when David heard it [when David afterward heard it], he said, I and my kingdom
are guiltless before the Lord [Jehovah] for ever from the blood of Abner the son
29 of Ner; Let it rest [be hurled] on the head of Joab and on all his father's house,
and let there not fail from the house of Joab one that hath an issue, or that is a
leper, or that leaneth on a staff [crutch[20]], or that falleth on [by] the sword, or that
30 lacketh bread. So[21] Joab and Abishai his brother slew Abner because he had slain
their brother Asahel at Gibeon in the battle.
31 And David said to Joab and to all the people that were with him, Rend your
clothes and gird you with sackcloth, and mourn before Abner. And king David
32 *himself* [*om.* himself] followed the bier. And they buried Abner in Hebron; and
the king lifted up his voice and wept at the grave of Abner, and all the people
33 wept. And the king lamented over Abner and said,

Died Abner [Must Abner die] as a fool[22] [*or* villain] dieth?

34 Thy hands were not bound
Nor thy feet put into fetters.
As a man falleth before wicked men
So fellest thou.

35 And all the people wept again over him. And when [*om.* when] all the people
came to cause David to eat [23] meat [bread] while it was yet day [*ins.* and] David
sware, saying, So do God to me and more also, if I taste bread or aught else till the
36 sun be down. And all the people took notice of it, and it pleased them; as[24] what-
37 soever the king did pleased all the people. For [And] all the people and all Israel
38 understood that day that it was not of the king to slay Abner the son of Ner. And
the king said unto his servants, Know ye not that there is a prince and a great man
39 fallen this day in Israel? And I am this day weak, *though* anointed king, and
these men the sons of Zeruiah be too hard for me; the Lord [Jehovah] shall [*om.*
shall] reward the doer of evil [wickedness] according to his wickedness.

[17] [Ver. 24. The Inf. Abs., the force of which cannot be exactly given in English. Perhaps the Sept. "in peace" here was designed as a rendering of this Inf., though it is not improbable that it is merely a repetition from the two preceding verses; it is therefore not to be inserted in the Heb. text (against Wellh.).—Tr.]

[18] [Ver. 25. The phrase "the son of Ner" is omitted by Syr. and Ar., and its points are omitted in one MS. (224 Kenn.)—why, is not clear.—The Sept. rendering: "dost thou not know the wickedness of Abner?" is a weakening of the original; the Syr. also has the neg.-interrog. form, and renders very well "that he came to flatter thee."—Tr.]

[19] [Ver. 27. The Prep. is omitted in the text, but some MSS. insert אֶל, and so the VSS., according to the Heb. usage.—Tr.]

[20] [Ver. 29. Böttcher and Erdmann (with Vulg. and Syr.) render: "one that holds a distaff," that is, an effeminate man (Prov. xxxi. 19). See the Exposition.—Tr.]

[21] [Ver. 30, Erdmann renders: "but Joab and Abishai had slain Abner," as if the purpose of the verse were to give the reason for the murder. Wellhausen holds the verse to be an interpolation on the ground that it adds nothing except the inclusion of Abishai in the guilt in order to justify David's curse on Joab's *family*. It seems better, however, to regard the verse not merely as giving the reason for the murder (which is given in verse 27), nor as superfluous, but as a concluding summing up of the incident, as is so common in Heb. narration.—Tr.]

[22] [Ver. 33. Sept.: "Will Abner die according to the death of Nabal?" taking נָבָל (fool) as a proper name. So in ver. 34 it has οὐ προσήγαγεν ὡς Νάβαλ, misunderstanding the כִּנְפוֹל of the Heb., which it read כְּנָבָל.—Tr.]

[23] [Ver. 35. De Rossi cites a reading in some MSS. לְהַבְרוֹת "to make a feast" (2 Kings vi. 23), which Kimchi said was written but not read, perhaps a clerical error.—Tr.]

[24] [Ver. 36. כְּכֹל. Wellhausen objects that this כְּ cannot be rendered as a conjunction (as in Eng. A. V.), and therefore prefers the Sept., which omits the כְּ. Syr. accords with Sept., and Chald and Syr. insert "and" before בְּעֵינֵי. The reading of Greek and Syr. ("and good in their eyes was all that the king did, and good in the eyes of all the people"), however, contains a weak repetition, and something like the Heb. text is required by the connection.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

III. Ch. iii. 7–21. *Abner quarrels with Ishbosheth, and goes over to David.*—Vers. 7, 8. *The falling out.* Its occasion was Abner's taking Saul's concubine, Rizpah,* the daughter of Aiah. The Harem was part of the property of the reigning house, and therefore fell to the successor, comp. xii. 8. Taking possession of it was a political act, and signified actual entrance on royal rights, comp. xvi. 21, and of this act Abner was guilty. Supply from the connection *Ishbosheth* (comp. *my father* and ver. 8) as subject of the verb *said.* His question: "Why," *etc.*, might be taken as the expression of *suspicion* that Abner was thus seeking the throne, for in the ancient Orient claim to the harem was claim to the throne, so especially with the Persian, comp. Herod. 3, 68; Justin. 10, 2. But, if Ishbosheth really had such a suspicion, Abner's conduct gives no ground for such a view; his act seems rather the outflow of passionate self-will and presumptuous contempt towards Ishbosheth. If he had really wished to seize the throne of Israel for himself, his conduct towards David (ver. 9 sq.) would be inexplicable. His answer in ver. 8 shows how loose his relation to Ishbosheth and concern for his cause already was. "*Dog's head,*" as in our language also, is the expression for something perfectly *despicable.* The words: "which is to Judah," omitted by Sept., are not to be connected with the preceding (Clericus: thinkest thou that I am worth no more to the Tribe of Judah than a dog's head? Syr.: Am I the head of the dogs of Judah? Ewald: Am I then a Judahite dog's head?—such an adjectival periphrasis would be very strange)—nor in sense to be connected with the following (Vulg.: who against Judah to-day show kindness; De Wette: who *in respect to* Judah now show kindness), but to be rendered simply as they stand: "who is for Judah, pertains to, holds with Judah" (Buns.). Abner is angered by the insult he thinks shown him by Ishbosheth's reproachful question. The sense of his reply is: that Ishbosheth treats him as a despicable man, who takes no interest in him, as one who belongs to his opponents, the party of the Tribe of Judah, whereas he 1) is showing only kindness to the whole house of Saul, and 2) especially has not delivered him, Ishbosheth, into the hand of David. By adducing these his services to the royal house Abner repels the reproach based on his appropriation of the concubine.† His words express the extremest contempt towards his king, and the strongest consciousness of services, to which the house of Saul and Ishbosheth owed everything. The "to-day" is significant; even "*now*" he occupies this position towards Saul's house; comp. the "made himself strong, was a strong helper" in ver. 6. The contrast to this comes out sharply in what follows. There follows—

Vers. 9–11, the sudden complete *breach* with the house of Saul and the solemn *oath* in respect to the house of David. This is the culmination of what is said in ver. 1 of David's advance in strength over against the house of Saul. (On the simple כִּ' in oaths see on ii. 27; 1 Sam. iii. 17.) The history does not show a formal divine *oath*, such as Abner here refers to. But the divine *choice* of David to be king, his *anointment* performed by Samuel at the divine command (1 Sam. xv. 28, 29; xvi. 1–12), and the therewith conjoined divine *declaration* which Samuel declares to be *inviolable* (1 Sam. xv. 29) because based on God's truthfulness (comp. Num. xxiii. 19)—all this had in fact the significance and weight of a divine oath. Abner's words presuppose that acquaintance with the promises given to David was, through the prophetic circles, widely extended. Abigail is an example of such acquaintance among the people (1 Sam. xxv. 28–31).—**So will I do to him**; Abner does not consider himself (as Cler. thinks) as the Lord's instrument for fulfilling his declaration to David, which he in fact was not. He merely says, that he will now make David king, as had been promised him by divine oath. The remark of Cler. that "military men do not sufficiently weigh what they say" does not apply here; for in Abner's words there is the distinct consciousness that over against the divine promise concerning David the cause of Saul and Ishbosheth is a lost one, but at the same time also the mortified ambition that thinks its services not sufficiently recognized, and the overweening pride of a vigorous and energetic man who thinks that he can of himself make history. In spite of his reference to a divine declaration, his conduct is anything but theocratic, is rather throughout autocratic, comp. ii. 8, 9: "he took Ishbosheth, and *made* him king." How far his previous energetic, autocratic activity for Saul's house was connected with ambitious, high-reaching plans for himself, is uncertain. In any case, however, so much is true: 1) that he knew David's divine call to be Saul's successor, and therefore stood in conscious opposition to the known will of God, and thus in conflict with himself, and 2) that it was only after his defeat in the battle with Joab (which he himself began, ii. 12 sq.) and his gradually confirmed recognition of the fact that Ishbosheth was wholly unfit for the kingly rule and its maintenance in the house of Saul, and in truth the personal insult now offered him by Ishbosheth—that he suddenly decided to break with the house of Saul and go over to David. How far ambition herein influenced him along with political insight, we cannot tell; but it is not probable that he showed so much energy in gaining over all Israel to David, as is afterwards related, without hope of a high and influential position with David.—With the words: "to translate the kingdom from Saul," comp. Samuel's word, 1 Sam. xv. 28.—**From Dan to Beersheba**, as in Judg. xx. 1; 1 Sam. iii. 20.—[*Bib. Com.* thinks it probable that Abner had before this begun to incline towards David, so that Ishbosheth had some ground for the taunt: "which belongeth to Judah," and this made it all the more stinging to Abner.—Tr.]—Ver. 11. **And he** (Ishbosheth) **could not answer, because he feared him.** This characterizes Ishbosheth sufficiently for the explanation of the whole situation. Having with an effort *plucked up courage* to ask that reproachful question, he here shows the greatest *feebleness*,

* [See xxi. 8–11 and Gen. xxxvi. 24.—Tr.]

† [It is supposed by some that Abner did not marry Rizpah, but used her as a harlot.—Tr.]

cowardice and *timidity* towards Abner. This also contributes to the explanation of what is said in ver. 1 concerning the house of Saul.

Vers. 12–21. *Abner's covenant with David.*—Ver. 12. The threat against Ishbosheth is straightway carried out by sending an embassy to David. תחתו is not "in his place" (Vulg. *pro se*, Cler., De Wette, Keil [Eng. A. V.: "on his behalf"]), which would be superfluous and unmeaning (Buns.), but, in keeping with Abner's passionate excitement in ver. 9, "on the spot, immediately," παραχρῆμα (Sept., Chald.), as in ii. 23, where Keil also adopts this meaning, though he *here* declares that there is no ground for it.—[On this whole passage see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]—The first "saying" (לֵאמֹר) can be taken here only in the usual sense as introduction of direct discourse, not as = "to say" in reference to the messengers. And the second "saying" is also so to be taken, and not as = "that is to say" (Buns., Then.), since it introduces another direct discourse of Abner: "Make a covenant," which cannot except by forcing be regarded as an *explanation* of the question: "to whom belongs the land?" rather the *demand* contained in it, as a *consequence* of the silent answer to this question, is, on account of its importance as the chief thing in the commission of the ambassadors, naturally appended by means of a repeated "saying." The saying: **To whom belongs** (or **whose is**) **the land?** does not relate to David, as if = "to whom does it belong but to thee?" This interpretation, that the land properly belonged to David by virtue of his anointment (Vat., S. Schmid, Ew. [Patrick, *Bib. Com.*]), would agree indeed with Abner's acknowledgment in ver. 9, but not with the following words: **Make a covenant with me to turn all Israel to thee**, which rather indicate that Abner means to say: "*the land belongs to me*" (Sanct., Thenius [Scott, Philipps]). This is quite in keeping with his proud, haughty nature, as hitherto manifested in his words and conduct, and also with the facts of the case, since in fact the whole land except Judah was still subject to Saul's house, that is, to him (Abner) as Dictator. Because he still as influential *ruler* controlled the greatest part of the land, he could 1) demand of David, as one standing on the same plane with him, to make a *covenant* with *him*, and 2) give him the promise (the product not only of strong self-consciousness, but also of extensive power): "*my hand* is with thee to turn *all Israel to thee.*" Obviously there is here not merely implicitly involved as answer to the above question, the declaration: "the land is his whom I, the leader of the army, shall favor" (Cler.), but also the expectation that, after the fulfillment of this promise, David would assign him the highest position in the army and in the nation next to himself. Abner's proud and haughty words hardly permit us to doubt that he was filled with such thoughts.—Ver. 13. David replies with a *condition*, namely, *the restoration of his wife Michal.**—**Thou shalt not see my face before** (= **except**) **thou bring Michal**, *etc.*—Certainly we should have the opposite of David's meaning (Then.) if we rendered: "Thou shalt not see my face except *before* thou bring Michal." But, if we retain the text (לִפְנֵי), this explanation is unnecessary, rather it quite answers to the original signification of the word to render literally: "except *in the face* of thy bringing Michal .... in thy coming to see my face," that is, thou shalt not see my face except by at the same time bringing me Michal when thou comest to see my face; thy coming to me to see my face shall not occur except in the presence of this fact, namely, that thou (= unless, before thou) bring Michal. It is therefore unnecessary either to omit the Prep. (לִפְנֵי) after the Sept., and change the following Inf. into a Perf., = "unless thou bring" (Then.), or to omit the "but" (כִּי אִם) = "thou shalt not see my face before thy bringing (= before thou bring)" (Böttcher).—Ver. 14 presupposes *the acceptance of this condition* by Abner. In realization of what Abner had threatened him with, *Ishbosheth* finds himself compelled to fulfil David's condition himself, and that immediately by *Abner's* own hand, to whom was assigned the duty of bringing, and who really did bring Michal to David (vers. 15, 16). To this end David sends a formal embassy to Ishbosheth, in order *legally* to demand and receive Michal back, she having been *illegally* taken by Saul and given to another man (1 Sam. xxv. 44). Seb. Schmid: "that it might be manifest that he had acted legally towards Phaltiel before his king, and taken her back, not carried her off by force from a husband." **Whom I espoused to me**, that is, purchased as bride, married.—**For a hundred foreskins**, comp. 1 Sam. xviii. 27, where two hundred is the number given. David thus justifies his claim that Michal lawfully belongs to him, since he had lawfully won her as his wife. Besides this *right* to Michal, which he was now for the first time in position successfully to assert, he was led to a reunion with her partly by *love* ("she loved him," 1 Sam. xviii. 27; xix. 11 sq.), partly by a *political motive;* as king he could not in the presence of the people leave Michal in a relation into which she had been forced against her will,* and he wished the people to see from his relation to Saul as son-in-law that he was free from hatred towards the latter.—Ver. 15. **And Ishbosheth sent**, that is, to Gallim, where Phaltiel, the present husband of Michal, dwelt, 1 Sam. xxv. 44, and sent Abner himself (ver. 16). Her husband cannot part with her without sorrow. [The Jewish tradition represents Phaltiel as the guardian merely, not the husband of Michal—a view that the text does not permit.—Tr.]—Ver. 16. A touching scene, briefly but vividly sketched. The faithful husband follows his wife weeping to *Bahurim*, where Abner, who therefore had himself brought Michal from Gallim, ordered him to return. *Bahurim*, the home of Shimei (xix. 17; 1 Kings ii. 8), a village near Jerusalem (Jos., *Ant.* 7, 9–7) north-east, on the road between the Mount of Olives and the Jordan

* הֲבִיאֲךָ (as elsewhere after לִפְנֵי) like the Perf., instead of the usual 'הֵבִיא (Ex. xxiii. 30; Lev. xxiii. 14 sq.; Deut. iv. 28). לִפְנֵי here = "before." Ew., § 238 *d*, § 337 *c*.

* [Whether she was divorced from David does not appear.—Tr.]

(Gilgal), not far from or in the plain of the Jordan (comp. xvi. 1, 5; xvii. 18).

Vers. 17–19. Abner's preparatory negotiations with the Elders of Israel and especially of Benjamin, and his report thereon to David.—Ver. 17. Before Abner carried out David's condition (the restoration of Michal), he had a *conversation* (דְּבַר־אָ׳ הָיָה) *with the Elders* of Israel, that is, the Northern Tribes with the exception of Benjamin.—**Both yesterday and the day before** (= in times past) **ye desired** [= sought] **David to be your king**—a striking testimony to the fact that outside of Judah also there had been a favorable sentiment towards David, against which Abner had energetically established and hitherto maintained Ishbosheth's authority. The existence of this favorable feeling towards David in the Northern Tribes is confirmed by 1 Chron. xii.—Ver. 18. **Now, then, do it**, that is, fulfil your desire, recognize him as your king. As *reason* for this demand Abner refers to a "*word of Jehovah*," which indeed in the form here given: **I will save my people Israel**, is never expressly mentioned as spoken "to David" (so the Vulg.); but it is to be regarded as *the word applied in the prophetic tradition* (which Abner, ver. 9, is well acquainted with) *to David*, with which *Saul* (1 Sam. ix. 16) received this divine commission, which in its completeness could only now be fulfilled by David.*—Ver. 19. The *special* elaborate and pressing negotiations with Benjamin were necessary not only because this tribe had enjoyed many advantages from the royal house of Saul, 1 Sam. xxii. 7 (Then.), but in general because, though numerically the smallest tribe, it had hitherto had the honor of furnishing the reigning family; it was necessary to overcome the tribal ambition and the tribe-interest, to which Saul appealed, 1 Sam. xxii. The "*also . . . also*" (גַּם־גַּם), which denotes *mutualness* (Ew., § 352 *a*), points out the close connection and relation between the negotiations carried on with Benjamin as the tribe most important for David, and the earnest conversation that Abner therefore had with David ("in the ears of David") at Hebron. He "went," namely, after these double negotiations, in order to bring Michal to David.—**All that seemed good**, that is, not their demands and conditions (De Wette, Then., Buns.), which does not accord with the context or lie in the words, but (since the negotiations referred to the recognition of David's divine right to the kingdom over all Israel, ver. 10) the willingness to recognize him as king, the recognition of his royal authority.—[Patrick observes that David so effectually attached the Benjaminites to him that, though they had been Saul's closest adherents, they became David's warm friends, and never afterwards left him. However, comp. 2 Sam. xx.—Tr.]—Ver. 20. The *twenty men*, who accompanied Abner to David and for whom he prepared a *feast*, appeared "as representatives of all Israel, in order by their presence to confirm Abner's overtures" (Keil).—[Patrick: The feast was not merely an entertainment, but of the nature of a league. *Bib.-Com.*: "It is remarkable that not a word should be said about the meeting of David and Michal."—Tr.]—Ver. 21. The same *quickness* with which Abner carried out his resolution to go over to David (ver. 12) fulfilled the required condition (ver. 16), pressed the preliminary negotiations (ver. 17 sq.) in order to inform David about them, he now shows in the further proceedings, that he may institute as soon as possible the solemn installation of David as king of Israel under formal conclusion of a covenant between king and people. The gradation in his following words: **I will arise and will go and will assemble all Israel to my lord**, is characteristic of the rapidity, excitedness and energy that we everywhere remark in Abner. He now for the first time calls David "his lord." He will "assemble the whole nation (*i. e.* in its elders and other representatives) to the solemn covenanting." This last was not to consist in the establishment of a constitution after the nature of a "constitutional monarchy" (Then.), which is wholly foreign to the theocratic kingdom, but the words: **that they may make a covenant with thee** mean: they are to vow to obey thee as the king given them by the Lord, thou promising to govern them as the theocratic king, through whom as His instrument the Lord Himself will rule over His people.—**And that thou mayest be king over all that thy heart desireth**, that is, not: "in a way or under conditions that thou canst accept" (Then.), but he is to rule as *he* desires; it does not, however, mean: "as thy soul desires" (Clericus), or "according to thy pleasure" (Dathe), because the conception of the theocratic rule excluded all arbitrariness from it, but "over all, according to which is the desire of thy soul," that is, according to the Lord's will and appointment, over the whole people and land. David had indicated the desire of his heart in his message to the Jabeshites. Abner was *dismissed* by David as his king who was in accord with his purpose. That he was now looked on by David and his adherents as thoroughly a friend, and received no harm from any body, is indicated by the concluding words: **And he went in peace.**

IV. Vers. 22–39. *Murder of Abner by Joab and his solemn interment by David.*—Ver. 22. Instead of the Sing. "came," referring to Joab as leader of the troop, Sept., Syr., Ar. render: "they came." "From the troop" came Joab with the servants of David, who had undertaken an expedition for *booty*. Whither, is not said, but probably outside the Israelitish territory near the tribe of Judah. In the incomplete organization of David's court, such expeditions were necessary for the support of the large army. "Abner was no longer with David;" probably he had purposely chosen the time when Joab, with the army, was absent, to carry out his plan. "He had gone *in peace*" is repeated from ver. 21 in contrast with the hostility afterwards shown him by Joab, when (ver. 23) on his return he learns that Abner had meantime been with David and had been dismissed *in peace*. [For the correction of the rendering of this verse in Eng. A. V. see "Text. and Gramm."—Tr.]—Ver. 24. Joab's reproach of David that he had sent Abner away—so that "he was now quite gone" (וַיֵּלֶךְ הָלוֹךְ. Ew. § 280 *b*)—supposes that

* Instead of the Inf. הוֹשִׁיעַ read with all VSS. and many MSS. the Impf. אוֹשִׁיעַ.

Abner had only come with evil and hostile purpose. [Joab, of course, was afraid that he would be superseded by Abner, if the latter entered David's service. He was younger and less renowned than Abner.—Tr.]—Ver. 25. Joab gives a reason for his charge of unwisdom against David in sending Abner away in peace: **Thou knowest** (or, as a question, knowest thou?) **Abner, that** ..... In a quick, passionate speech, for the truth of which he appeals at the outset to David's knowledge of Abner's character (against Thenius' remark: "had David *known* what Joab here says, he would have acted differently"), he makes a *threefold* charge against Abner, with the intent of thereby branding him as spy and traitor. He declares that Abner came 1) *to trick him out of his most secret thoughts*. The verb (פָּתָה) means "to be open" (Ps. xx. 19), Piel "to make open, persuade, get one's secrets from him" (Judg. xiv. 15; xvi. 5); so here; 2) to learn David's *outgoing and incoming*, that is, all his present undertakings, his whole action and course of life (comp. Deut. xxviii. 6; Ps. cxxi. 8); 3) *all that he will do*, all his plans for the future.—Ver. 26. *Without David's knowledge* (whether expressly in David's name, falsely used by him, is not stated) he sends messengers and brings Abner back, making him believe, no doubt, that David had something further to say to him. **The pit** (or **cistern**) **of Sirah**, to which Abner had gotten when he was turned back, according to Jos. *Ant.* 7, 1, 5, distant twenty stadia [= nearly two and a half English miles] from Hebron, is now unknown; the name is perhaps to be derived from a verb (סוּר) meaning "to turn in" (Thenius), and denotes an inn or caravanserai. [According to others, so-called as surrounded with thorns, *Sirim*, סִירִים (Philippson).—Tr.]—Ver. 27. [*Bib. Comm.:* Abner's conduct bespeaks his entire reliance on David's good faith.—Tr.] After Abner's return to Hebron, Joab met him in the gate of the city, and turned him "aside to the middle of the gate, in order to speak with him quietly." Clericus: "made him turn aside, took him apart" (the Hiphil הִטָּה is transitive as in Job xxiv. 4; Numb. xxii. 23). Joab could not speak with him in the way where people were going out and coming in. He had therefore to take him aside to the places in the gate-space, where, according to the oriental custom, men used to meet for private or public conversations and consultations. **To the middle of the gate.**—Joab drew Abner to the middle of the inner gate-space (which was no doubt roofed) between the places of exit and entrance, because it was not so light there, and one could better escape the notice of the passers-by, who, however, were probably not very numerous. Bunsen renders well: "made him turn aside (from the way) near the middle of the gate." For Joab wished, as he made Abner believe, to talk with him "in quiet, undisturbed, in private" (בַּשֶּׁלִי). There he stabbed him in the abdomen (הַחֹמֶשׁ, comp. ii. 23) [not "under the fifth rib," as in Eng. A. V.—Tr.]. **For the blood of Asahel his brother** see ii. 23; that is, to avenge or punish the death of his brother. According to this it was an act of revenge for bloodshed. But Abner had not wilfully slain Asahel, but in self-defence, when the latter pressed on him, ii. 22 sq. But blood-vengeance was appointed only for intentional killing, and he was protected by law from it, who had killed a man unintentionally (Deut. iv. 41 sq.; Josh. xx. 1–9). Joab's deed was a murder, like that which he afterwards committed on Amasa, xx. 11. He thereby cast false suspicion on David (comp. ver. 37), whose friendly relation to Abner he yet must have known, since David no doubt informed him in their conversation (vers. 24, 25) of Abner's true position. The avenging of blood was a mere pretext; the real ground of Joab's deed was envy and ambition, as Josephus already rightly holds. He feared that Abner would take a higher position in the new kingdom than himself—especially would cut him out of the rank of general-in chief of the whole army. Grotius: "an equal and rival in military glory galled him."

Ver. 28 sq. What David said of this crime. **And when David afterwards heard of it.**—The word "afterwards" (as the "David knew it not" in ver. 26) certifies that David had no share in Joab's deed. David 1) declares *his innocence* of this murder. He distinguishes between *himself* personally and "his *kingdom*," that is, his royal house, his "hereditary successors on the throne" (Thenius), who no more than himself could be visited with divine punishment therefor. Comp. 1 Ki. ii. 31–33. On the other hand, he affirms 2) that the righteous punishment of God in requital of this crime must fall both on the *person* and on the *house* (the posterity) of Joab. Let the blood of Abner **turn, roll, plunge on the head.**—This strong expression, instead of the ordinary "let it come," answers to the enormity of the crime and the energy of David's righteous anger. "And let there not fail," literally "not be cut off, separated, exterminated" (יִכָּרֵת), so that it no longer exist, comp. Josh. ix. 23. **One that hath an issue** (זָב), one that pines away miserably with seminal or mucous flow,—comp. Leviticus xv. 2 sq., and **a leper,** see Leviticus xiii. 1–46, and **one that holds the distaff.**—The word (פֶּלֶךְ) means in Heb., Talm., Arab. *only* "distaff," never "*staff*" (Böttcher), comp. Prov. xxxi. 19. Usually indeed the phrase is rendered after the Sept. (κρατῶν σκυτάλην) "one that holds a staff;" that is, a cripple, lame, or blind (the last by Aquila). But against this it is to be said with Böttcher that, apart from the fact that the word cannot be shown to mean "staff," the phrase "one that holds a staff" does not necessarily denote a cripple, since the staff was held by "rulers and men of eminence (Judg. v. 14; Gen. xxxviii. 18; Numb. xxi. 18), old men (Zech. viii. 4), travellers (Luke vi. 3), shepherds (1 Sam. xvii. 40; Mic. vii. 14), and where a cripple is described with a staff, the expression is quite different (Ex. xxi. 19)." It is therefore better (with Böttcher) to take this as a contrast to the next described unfortunate strong warrior who "falls by the sword"=the weakly "spindle-holder, unfit for war." "The Greeks also had their 'Hercules with the distaff' as a type of unmanly feebleness, and for a warrior like Joab there could be no worse wish than that there might be a *distaff*-holder among his descendants" (Böttcher). So also Vulg., Schulz, Maurer (after Prov. xxxi.

19). [In spite of this forcible and striking argument of Böttcher (which is also adopted by Thenius) it seems better to take the signification "crutch," chiefly because the other terms of imprecation in this verse are all literal, and the term "distaff-holder" would be figurative. The rendering "crutch" or "staff" is adopted by Gesenius, Ewald, Philippson, *Bible Commentary*, and others, and may be given without violence to the Hebrew word, though in the one other passage in the Old Testament in which it occurs it means "distaff"—Tr.] **And that lacks bread.**—The indication of bitter poverty. These exclamations of David express no feeling of revenge (as indeed he undertakes no revenge or punishment against Joab and his house), but commit to the holy and righteous God the inevitable punishment of such a violation of the divine command. They are not "genuinely *Jewish*" (Thenius), but genuinely *theocratic*, as the expression of the clear, energetic consciousness of God's punitive justice which maintains the laws of the moral government of the world and the foundations of the kingdom of God, and which here he wishes may exhibit itself on Joab's house in a fourfold manner: in miserable, levitically unclean *sicknesses*, in despicable *weakness and crippling*, in violent *death*, and in bitter *poverty*. As to Joab's violent end, comp. 1 Ki. ii. 28-34, especially vers. 31-33, and as respects the curse on his *house*, see Ex. xx. 5. [The ancient Jewish writers regarded this imprecation of David's as sinful. The text passes no opinion on it, but from the religious-theocratic point of view of the time, it would seem even necessary that the wrath of God should be specially and sharply invoked on so high-handed a crime, especially as David was not able to call the criminal to legal account.—Tr.] Ver. 30. Supplementary remark of the narrator, who 1) confirms the fact that the slaying of Asahel by Abner was the ground (pretext) for the murder of the latter just related, and 2) adds the important statement that Joab's act was not merely *personal*, but also a *family-act:* "*Joab and Abishai* slew Abner." Abishai's part in the affair is not related. Literally: "threw themselves on him," the verb being used with Dat. instead of Accus., Isaiah xxii. 13 (Böttcher, Then.).

Vers. 31-39. *David's mourning for Abner.* Ver. 31. David said to *Joab* (as him who by his murderous act was chiefly and terribly interested) and to all the people that were "with him" (those *about* him), not merely to the "courtiers" (Thenius): **Rend your garments,** *etc.*—He ordered a public *mourning* with all the usual *ceremonies* (rending garments, putting on sackcloth, that is, rough mourning garments of haircloth, and lamentations for the dead). We must distinguish *two principal acts:* 1) *The mourning* not *over*, for, in honor of (Ew. § 217 *l*) Abner, but "before" him (לִפְנֵי), in the presence of his corpse; 2) the *burial*, ver. 31 *b* sq.: **And the king David followed the bier.*** The word "*king*" is put emphatically first to indicate the official character that he as king gave to these obsequies, in order to show his personal deep sorrow for the death of Abner which concerned the whole people, and to stifle at the outset any suspicion that he had a share in it. His "*tears at the grave*" showed the *genuineness* of his grief to the people who shared in his trouble and wept with him. His *elegy* (vers. 33. 34) is the expression of the deepest sorrow over Abner's *innocent* and *shameful* death. In reference to his guiltlessness he exclaims: **Must Abner die as a worthless fellow dies?**—as a *nabal* (נָבָל), a *fool;* where this term is used of immorality and crime, these, like denial of God and godlessness (Ps. xiv. 1), are regarded under the point of view of *foolishness; nabal* always denotes hollowness, emptiness, insipidity (see Moll [in Lange's *Bible-Work*] on Psalm xiv. 1), and signifies therefore somewhat more precisely "good-for-naught." [The sentence may be paraphrased: is this the fate that the noble Abner was to meet, to die like a worthless fool? alas that he found so inglorious a death.—Tr.] But he was murdered in shameful wise also: **Thy hands were not bound and thy feet not put into fetters**—with free hands, with which he might have defended himself; with free feet, with which he might have escaped from overpowering force; without suspecting evil, he was attacked and murdered as a defenceless man, who yet might have defended himself. (De Wette (against the לֹא) wrongly renders: Thy hands were *never* bound, thy feet *never* put into fetters.) Only dishonorable, wicked men could so act. This lament of David increased the grief of the people, so that "they wept still more over Abner."—Ver. 35. David's grief is strongest and most enduring—he refrains entirely from food. Fasting often occurs as a sign of sorrow—see i. 12. All the people (that is, as many as were present) came **to cause David to eat bread**—that is, not to give him to eat (De Wette), as chap. xiii. 5 (an impossible conception in respect to "all the people"), but to demand of him to take food. Josephus: "his friends tried to force him to take nourishment." It was the custom for mourners to fast immediately after the death of their friends, whereupon their relatives and friends exerted themselves to comfort them, and persuaded them to strengthen themselves with food and drink, comp. xii. 16, 17, 20; Jer. xvi. Perhaps the people here acted in accordance with this custom; but their demand may also be referred to the mourning meal that followed the burial. But David refuses with an oath;* up to *evening* he will eat nothing. The expression of grief here reaches its culmination.—Ver. 36. The people **took notice of it**—namely, of his deep sorrow, and *estimated* this expression of his mourning as corresponding to the intensity of his grief. **It pleased them, as† all that the king did pleased all the people.**—Thus he was not only freed from suspicion of share in the murder of Abner (ver. 37), but won the love and confidence of the people.—Ver. 38. An echo of the elegy: **Know ye not that there is a prince and a**

* [The bier (מִטָּה) was a bed-like structure, often magnificent. So Herod's, Jos. *Bell. Jud.* I. 23, 9. See more in Comms. of Pat. and Philipps.—Tr.]

* אִם is asseverative particle—"if," that is, "surely not;" כִּי introduces the oath.

† כְּכֹל. [On this see "Text. and Gramm."—Tr.]

great man fallen this day in Israel?—*Not:* "great prince" (Thenius, after Sept., omitting the copula), since the distinction between the *prince*= "army-leader" and the *great man* is perfectly appropriate. Abner was a "prince" by his distinguished military ability, which (as this exclamation intimates) David might have employed for all Israel; he was a "great man" by reason of his lofty qualities of character and virtues, his power of action, his courage, the honorable self-conquest he exhibited in turning from his previous false course of opposition to David, the obedience that he yielded to the will of God, and the zealous desire he showed to serve by deeds the true king of Israel. On account of his natural noble endowments and these moral* qualities, Abner rightly seems to David to be a great man in Israel, not merely, therefore, in the incorrect sense in which the term has been applied to a Napoleon.—Ver. 39. The usual explanation: "but I am still weak ..... and these men are too strong for me;" that is, as a weak young king I feel unable to bring a man like Joab to justice; I must therefore confine myself to an imprecation, and leave the punishment to God (Jos., Theod., Brent., Tremell., S. Schmid, Clericus, De Wette, Keil [Patrick]), is wholly untenable; for David could not and durst not so express himself. It would have been very *unwise* to acknowledge his fear and weakness in respect to Joab and Abishai; nor would it have been *true;* for he who had conquered Abner, by whose side stood 600 heroes, in whose grief over Abner's murder all the people shared, no doubt had power to punish this crime; such a self-exculpation based on confession of weakness does not at all agree with the courage and fearlessness that form a fundamental trait of David's character.—Against Ewald's explanation: "I indeed now live in palaces and am crowned king, and yet the sons of Zeruiah are out of my reach," it is to be remarked with Thenius that the word רַךְ [Eng. A. V.: "weak, tender"]) for whose meaning "well-living" he cites Isa. xlvii. 1; Deut. xxviii. 54–56, is used in those passages in a bad sense=*delicatus* [luxurious, effeminate], and that the other adj. (קָשִׁים) cannot mean "out of reach;" and there is the further objection to this rendering that David had as yet no very splendid position, and his dwelling proudly in royal palaces is out of the question. Against Bunsen's rendering: "hard, out of my reach" (Ex. xlviii. 25), Thenius rightly remarks that *hard* and *out of reach* are two different conceptions, and that the former can be used only of *things*, not of *persons*. Böttcher translates: "And I am to-day *easy*, and am crowned king, but these men—are too rough for me," and finds in the "easy" (רַךְ) a double contrast, on the one hand between David's present comfortable circumstances and Abner's sad death, and on the other hand between the *easy* disposition (natural in easy circumstances) inclined to pardon (as was lawful and right for the king), and the *rough* deed of the sons of Zeruiah. But 1) "we cannot suppose such a double meaning in the declaration" (Thenius), and 2) the history is in conflict with this supposition of royal well-living on the part of David, who with his men must have depended chiefly for their living on the booty taken in their incursions. Thenius alters the text* after the Sept. and translates: "know yė not that ... and that I am to-day weak and am raised to the position of the king. Those men ... are harder than I. Jehovah reward," *etc.* But the text of the Sept in the first third of the verse is too confused† to allow an emendation of the Hebrew to be based on it. Nor could David yet have said: "I am raised to the position of the king." Holding to the text, we might rather adopt Thenius' explanation, according to which David, over against Abner's greatness and importance for all Israel (which he had just affirmed), sets his own present situation, in which this distinguished man would have been of the greatest value to him, so that the sense would be: "How well in my situation could I have used such a man as *Abner*, I who have just been set on the throne! What these men have done I could not have done! (comp. xvi. 10). But God will judge!" Yet in this explanation also a confession of *weakness* would be the chief point, which in David's present situation is altogether improbable. David was actually not "set on the throne" in respect to all Israel; that does not take place till ver. 1. The little word "just" is put in. Before the whole people David has avowed the deepest, sincerest grief of heart for Abner by declaring that he would continue his fasting till the sun went down. Then follows in vers. 36, 37 the parenthetical *double statement* of the impression that his conduct made on the *people:* they approved his feeling, and were firmly convinced that he had no part in the murder. It is then further related in ver. 38 (which connects itself with ver. 35) how David expressed to the narrower circle of "his servants" (that is, his immediate royal retinue) his grief at the loss that he and Israel had suffered by Abner's death. In ver. 39 follows immediately the avowal of his *disposition of mind*, that he as king showed himself *soft* and weak, while those men showed themselves *so hard.* The *contrast* of "*soft*" and "*hard*" (here evidently intended) is thus fully preserved in respect not to the political situation, but to mental constitution. The meaning of David's words would thus be: Wonder not that I so give myself up to grief. You know what a great man we and all Israel have lost. I am then soft and weak, I, an anointed king, while these men, the sons of Zeruiah, are in disposition *harder* than I. They (at least Joab) were obliged indeed to take part in the ceremony of mourning (ver. 31); their hard, inflexible mind, whence proceeded the evil deed, showed itself in their mien and deportment at the ceremony. This gave David occasion to contrast his weakness, his absorption in grief with their hardness, a contrast that is sharpened by his comparing them with himself as king. The

* [Of these moral qualities nothing is said in the narrative. Abner *may* have possessed them, but we know nothing about it. Our author's picture is the creation of his own imagination.—Tr.]

* He reads וְאָנֹכִי to connect with the preceding כִּי (καὶ ὅτι ἐγώ) and הַמֶּלֶךְ מוּקָם תַּחַת instead of וּמָשׁוּחַ מֶלֶךְ.

† συγγενής for רַךְ—probably corrupted from ἀσθενής (Böttcher)—and καθεσταμένος ὑπὸ βασιλέως alongside of καθεστ. εἰς βασιλέα.

concluding words: **The Lord will reward ....** are the natural expression of the feelings and thoughts that filled David's soul when he looked at their hardness and inflexible defiance (comp. ver. 29).

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. "*The house of Saul grew weaker and weaker*," chap. iii. 1. This is the theme of the following narrative of Ishbosheth's kingdom under Abner's lead and guidance. In the first place, the heir to Saul's throne appears as a very weak man, unfit to rule, without character or will, who is merely an *object* of Abner's mighty, unlimited activity, and never (except for a moment in the affair of the concubine) attempts to take the position of *subject* [that is, independent agent] in respect to Abner. While David undertakes nothing of his own will and strength in order to overthrow the dynasty of Saul and gain the promised kingdom over all Israel, patiently waiting for the fulfilment of the promise given him, this fulfilment is already introduced by the fall of Saul's house through its own weakness, and by its loss of the royal throne through the incapacity of its representative for the royal office, with the co-operation at last of Abner, who was still its only support. Ishbosheth appears as a will-less, weak mock-king in degrading dependence on the mighty, vigorous, heroic nature of Abner. When the latter, in reply to the charge made against him of high-handed and reckless proceeding against the royal house, breaks forth into anger, discarding all reverence for his royal master and openly announcing his defection to David, Ishbosheth has nothing to answer, because he fears Abner. Indeed in his utter helplessness Ishbosheth seems to have entertained the thought of sharing the royal dignity with David, being perhaps ready to cede to him the greater part of the power. At least he became Abner's passive tool so far as to lend his hand to the fulfilment of the condition on which David was willing to yield to his proposals, namely, the restoration of Michal. "The Scripture presents in him a living example of how the sacredly held right of legitimate inheritance has no root when it is not ennobled by a vigorous personality. When the divine calling is lacking, no legitimate pretensions help" (P. Cassel, *Herz. s. v.*).

2. "David grew stronger and stronger." This second statement also in iii. 1 is in respect to David the title of this section. While David bears himself patiently and humbly in respect to his royal interests, the spirit of the people, under the misrule of Ishbosheth, turns to him more and more in the desire that he may be king over the remaining tribes also (ver. 17). Even the bearer and support of Saul's kingdom, the mighty Abner, inclines secretly to him on the ground of his ever clearer consciousness and conviction that it is Jehovah's will that the kingdom of Israel should depart from the house of Saul and pass over to David; till his rupture with Ishbosheth leads to his open transition to David's side. Abner had indeed, against his better convictions, maintained his partisan position against David and continued his hostile efforts against him, and it was only after the overthrow of his hitherto unlimited power and the violence done to his self-esteem and ambition, that he came to the conclusion to abandon his position as David's opponent; and certainly ambitious plans and views for his position in the new kingdom were not wanting in his transition to David and his energetic efforts *for* David. But all this could give David no ground to reject Abner's offer; rather he was under obligation to employ this unsought change in Abner's mind and position (which entered into his life as a factor permitted by the Lord) for the end (fixed not by himself, but by the Lord) of his kingdom over all Israel, the kingdom of Saul falling to pieces of itself, when the Dictator, who had furnished its outward support, left it. Abner's defection from Ishbosheth and effort to gain from the whole people the recognition of David's authority was an important preliminary step thereto. But further, by a wonderful providence of God, Abner's shameful murder by the envious, ambitious Joab was to lead to this result, namely, that, after the *Elders* of the people had already shown themselves willing to recognize his authority over all Israel, *the whole people* gave him their love and confidence; "all that he did pleased them" (ver. 36).

3. The realization of *the plans and aims of the wisdom of God* in the development of David up to his ascension of the royal throne in Israel is secured by the co-operation of human efforts and acts (like Abner's and Joab's), which have their ground not in zeal for the cause of the kingdom of God, but in selfish ends and motives of the self-seeking, sinful heart. Human sin must subserve the purposes of God's government and kingdom.—The absolute freedom of control in the things of His kingdom takes the activity of human freedom into its dispensations, and weaves them into the fast closed web of divine arrangements and acts, in which they fulfil the plans of divine wisdom.—J. Hetz (*Geschicht. Davids* I. 309) remarks on ver. 18: "Here also it is to be noted how, merely by preparing circumstances, the *free* actions of men have been forced to accord with divine declarations, of which fact this theocracy gives so many examples."

4. David's words concerning *Joab and his house* are no more the expression of *revenge* than the orders that he gives to Solomon in his last words (1 Kings ii. 5 sq.) respecting the punishment of Joab for this bloody crime (against Dunker, *Gesch. des Alterth.* I. 386); but they express his moral *horror* at this evil deed, and at the same time the everlasting *law of God's requiting justice*, which reaches not merely the person, but also the posterity (Ex. xx. 5) of the offender. David (though, as theocratic king, he had the right to do it) does not himself execute the deserved act of divine righteousness on Joab, not, as the common view is, because he felt himself too *weak* in his royal office, but because he wished to avoid the appearance of personal revenge, especially now when Abner had just done him such great services. He therefore committed to the Lord the requital and expiation of this crime, ver. 39. This could be accomplished, however, only through a human instrument. The commission to this end he accordingly gave to his son Solomon (1 Kings ii. 5 sq.), who, not as his

son, as a private person, but as his successor on the throne and as theocratic king, had therein an official duty to fulfil. For "in the kingdom of God, in which ruled the law of earthly requital, such a crime might not go unpunished" (O. v. Gerlach).

5. In *David's ethical conduct* in this important episode also, which immediately precedes his ascension of the promised throne, we see individual prefigurations of his humble obedience to the Lord, without whose will he will take no step in life. Under the strongest temptations to arbitrariness and violence, which were the rule with the ancient oriental princes, he maintains strict self-control, exhibits uniform circumspection, a wisdom and discretion cognizant of God's ways, and does not permit anger at the deed of horror that had been done under his eyes to lead him to immediate, bloody punishment. We must guard against exaggerated demands on the morality of the Old Testament men of God, that we may not unfairly judge them by an improper standard, and that we may not pervert the truth of the divine development of revelation by confounding the stand-points of the Old and New Testaments. David's invocation of divine punishment on Joab (ver. 29) (wherein, indeed, we must distinguish between the eternal truth of the divine justice and the *sinful* element of subjective passion) is held by some to be unjustifiable from the Christian point of view. To this it is to be replied once for all, that David belongs to the Old Testament, not the New Testament economy, stands on the stand-point of the Law, not of the Gospel, and therefore is not to be ethically judged according to the New Testament stand-point.

[Dr. Erdmann's remarks on David's moral motives are determined in part by his interpretation of ver. 39, about which there is much room for doubt. It may be merely a confession of political weakness that he here makes privately to his friends, in which case his self-control is simply political sagacity. David had high moral and spiritual qualities; at the same time we must guard against the determination to find the loftiest theocratic motives in every act of his life. Dr. Erdmann holds that in ver. 39 David affirms his own softness of nature as reason for his deep grief over Abner, in contrast with the hardness of Joab. The objection to this is that it does not explain sufficiently why David immediately appends an appeal to God for the punishment of the doer of evil. Further, the reason assigned by our author for David's failure to punish Joab (namely, his desire to avoid the appearance of revenge) seems unsatisfactory; nobody would have accused him of personal vengeance. To the usual interpretation Dr. Erdmann objects that a confession of political weakness on David's part would have been unwise and untrue. But, what more natural than that he should make such a statement to a select body of friends; and that it was not true, we are not warranted in saying, since we do not know Joab's power and position. The words of the Heb. may refer to political relations, and such a statement would accord with the whole history. It must be allowed, however, that the words are obscure.—Tr.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 7 sq. The designs that God has with His chosen ones for the furtherance of His kingdom often have the way smoothed for them through human sins.—Single wicked deeds, proceeding from momentary passionate excitement, do often in God's government give occasion for changes having important consequences.—Division among the opposers of God's kingdom must subserve the furtherance of His aims, and on the contrary, discord among those who, on a like ground of faith, wish to live and labor for the same tasks in the kingdom of God must help the wicked one and further his aims.—Ver. 12 sqq. When an opposer of God's word honestly turns, we should without reluctance give him the hand, without undertaking to pass judgment on the motives that are hidden in his heart.

Ver. 13. Where the honor of God and His holy ordinances are concerned, a man should guard his rights, and demand reparation of a right that has been impaired.—Ver. 17 sq. He who has left the ways of unrighteousness, upon which for a long time he had consciously or unconsciously gone, and returned to the way of truth and righteousness, will exhibit the sincerity of his change by a so much the more earnest striving to restore the damage done by his previous conduct, and to carry into execution the previously hindered aims of divine wisdom and love.

Ver. 23 sq. That there is a kingdom of evil is proven by the fact that a man's turning from evil to good, which pleases God and is a joy to the angels, commonly excites bitterness and hate in wicked men, who see their aims and plans thereby interfered with, and awakens an envy and jealousy that does not shrink from the most wicked deeds.

Ver. 28 sq. The honor of one's good name is too precious a possession to let even the suspicion cleave to it of participation in other men's guilt. Manly honor demands that in every way, by word and deed and behaviour, one should set forth his innocence when the circumstances and relations give occasion to untrue and unjust accusations.

Ver. 33 sq. In lamenting the loss of great men who were prominent in advancing the kingdom of God, we not merely render to them the honor they deserve, but also praise God who gave them.—Ver. 36. That king will be most honored and loved by his people who walks in the ways of God, and by a noble disposition, magnanimity and hearty goodness himself awakens the nobler feelings of his people.—Ver. 39. In patience and humility must we refer to God the Lord the righteous requital for wicked transgression of His holy commandments. Indifference thereto makes one a partaker of like guilt.—[Comp. above at close of "Hist. and Theol."—Tr.]

On ver. 8. Schlier: How many stand together and seem the most inseparable friends, so long as each hopes to gain his end; but only let this aim remove to a distance, only let it become manifest that a selfish or ambitious desire is not

going to be fulfilled, and how soon is all rent in twain! For there is nothing that really unites men but the fear of God. No friendship is permanent and progressive that is not rooted in the fear of God.—[Vers. 9, 10. SCOTT: While men go on in their sins *apparently without concern*, they are often conscious that they are fighting against God.—TR.]—On ver. 16. F. W. KRUMMACHER: It appears from this occurrence that, amid the wilderness of ruined domestic relations by which Israel was then overgrown, there was yet here and there to be found the flower of a true and inward love and fidelity. This bloomed in David's house also, but not unstunted, and he has not remained untouched by the curse which God had laid upon the abomination of polygamy in Israel.—On ver. 21. "When a man's ways please Jehovah, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him." Prov. xvi. 7.

[Ver. 27. HENRY: In this, 1. It is certain that the Lord was righteous. Abner had against the convictions of his conscience opposed David, and had now deserted Ishbosheth, under pretence of regard to God and Israel, but really from pride and revenge. 2. It is as certain that Joab was unrighteous. (1) Even the pretence for what he did was very unjust. (2) The real cause was jealousy of a rival. (3) He did it treacherously, under pretence of speaking peaceably to Abner, Deut. xxvii. 24. (4) He knew that Abner was now actually in David's service.—TR.]

[ROBINSON: Ver. 33. Are we all, in our several stations, grieved for the wickedness which we are compelled to witness, and which we cannot prevent or remedy?—Ver. 39. Those who possess the highest authority cannot do all they would. We should compassionate rather than envy their situation.—HENRY: Ver. 38. When he could not call him a saint and a good man, he said nothing of that; but what was true he gave him the praise of, that he was "a prince and a great man."—Ver. 39. This is a diminution, (1) To David's greatness; he is anointed king, and yet is kept in awe by his own subjects. (2) To David's goodness; he ought to have done his duty, and trusted God with the issue. *Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum.*—TAYLOR: Had he put Joab to death, public opinion would have sustained him in the execution of justice; and even if it had not, he would have had the inward witness that he was doing his duty to the state. For a magistrate to be weak, is to be wicked. . . . O what suffering—may I not even say what sin?—David might have saved himself from, if he had only thus early rid himself of the tyrannic and overbearing presence of Joab!—WORDSWORTH: He would have probably prevented other murders, such as that of Ishbosheth and of Amasa; and he would have been spared the sorrow of giving on his death-bed the warrant of execution against Joab, to be put in effect by Solomon. "Impunity invites to greater crimes." "He is cruel to the innocent who spares the guilty."—TR.]

[Vers. 15, 16. We pity a man who weeps in helpless and apparently innocent suffering. But consider a little, and it may appear that this is only the consequence of a wrong action he committed long ago (1 Sam. xxv. 44). Our pity is not thereby destroyed; but its character is greatly changed.—Vers. 17, 18. How gracefully rulers can yield to the *popular wish* when they conclude that it is their own interest to do so. And how zealous some men will suddenly become to carry out *God's own will* when their own places have been so changed as to coincide therewith!—HALL: Nothing is more odious than to make religion a stalking-horse to policy.—TR.]

[Ver. 25. An ambitious and unscrupulous man is quick to discern, and ready to distort, the selfish aims of others. "Set a thief to catch a rogue." And one who acts from impure motives exposes himself to be accused of grossly wicked designs which he has not at all entertained.—Vers. 27, 30. O mad ambition, that pleads fraternal love and sacred duty to the dead as an excuse for the foul deed that removes a rival! (The principle of blood-revenge did not apply, for Asahel was killed in war; and if it had applied, Hebron was a city of refuge.)—Vers. 33, 34. The bitterest fruit that even civil war can bear is assassination, a thing to awaken horror in every noble mind.—TR.]

[Ver. 38. Abner, *the soldier turned politician.*—Or a sermon might be made on the general career and character of Abner. See 1 Chron. ix. 36; 1 Sam. xiv. 51; xvii. 57; xxvi. 3–14; 2 Sam. ii. and iii., and the notes; and comp. iv. 1. —TR.]

THIRD SECTION.

David becomes Sole Ruler over Israel.

Chapter IV. 1—V. 5.

I. *Murder of Ishbosheth.* Chap. IV. 1–8.

1 And when [*om.* when] Saul's son[1] heard that Abner was dead in Hebron, [*ins.*
and] his hands were [became] feeble, and all the Israelites [Israel] were troubled.
2 And Saul's son had two men that were captains of bands. The name of the one
was Baanah and the name of the other Rachab, the sons of Rimmon a Beerothite,
3 of the children of Benjamin; for[2] Beeroth also was reckoned to Benjamin. And
the Beerothites fled to Gittaim, and were [have been] sojourners there until this
4 day. And[3] Jonathan, Saul's son, had a son that was lame of his feet. He was
five years old when the tidings came of Saul and Jonathan out of Jezreel, and his
nurse took him up and fled; and it came to pass, as she made haste to flee, that
5 he fell and became lame. And his name was Mephibosheth. And the sons of
Rimmon the Beerothite, Rechab and Baanah, went, and came about the heat of
the day to the house of Ishbosheth, who lay on a bed at noon [and he was taking
6 his midday-rest].[4] And they came thither[5] into the midst of the house, *as though*
they would have fetched [fetching] wheat; and they smote him under the fifth rib
7 [in the abdomen]; and Rechab and Baanah his brother escaped.[6] For when they
[And they] came into the house, [*ins.* and] he lay on his bed in his bed-chamber,
and they smote him and slew him and beheaded him, and took his head, and gat

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. Sept. (Jebosthe) and Syr. (Ashboshul) prefix the name "Ishbosheth," and Sept. also in the beginning of ver. 2. Wellhausen thinks the omission due to the same feeling that led to the change of Eshbaal (or Ishbaal) to Ishbosheth, namely, repulsion to a bad (idolatrous) name. But the omission may naturally be explained as a breviloquence of the narrator, the context clearly fixing the reference to Ishbosheth; similarly the Sept. inserts in this verse after Abner the words "son of Ner." Comp. 1 Sam. xxii. 7, 8, 9, 12, 13.—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 2. The brackets of Eng. A. V. may just as well be omitted, since the Heb. regards this statement as part of the narrative, and ver. 4 is as much a parenthesis as ver. 3.—Aq. improperly makes these men εὔζωνοι = שָׂרֵי גְ.—The notice vers. 2 *b*, 3, is an archæological or historical remark of the editor, not necessarily a "marginal remark" (Wellh.) that has gotten into the text.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 4. This verse is an explanatory historical remark; see the Exposition. It is "too peculiar for a gloss" (Wellh.).—"Made haste" is not strong enough for חָפַז, which contains the notion of "terror," Sym. ἐθορυβεῖσθαι, Erdmann: *sie sich in der angst beeilte*, Chald., Syr., Cahen, Philippson as Eng. A. V.—The name Mephibosheth is written by Sept. Memphibosthe, by other Greek VSS. Memphibaal. For the first part of the name no satisfactory etymology has been found, and it is not improbably a corruption of Merib in Meribbaal, 1 Chron. ix. 40.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 5. Lit.: "sleeping the sleep of noon" (example of cognate Acc.).—Instead of "about" we may render "at (or, in) the heat of the day."—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 6. הֵנָּה, "hither," which Norzius (cited by De Rossi) declares to be the true reading. Some MSS. and printed Edd., together with Sept., Syr., Chald., read הִנֵּה, "behold." (So the Chald. text of P. de Lagarde; but others have the masc. pron. הֵמָּה, "they.")—Instead of עַד תּוֹךְ, some MSS. and EDD. have אֶל־תּוֹךְ.—Tr.

[6] [Ver. 6. Two points are to be noted in the criticism of the difficult text of vers. 6, 7: 1) the seeming repetition of the masoretic text, double account of the murder; 2) the divergence of the Sept. in ver. 6 especially from the Heb. The Vulg. agrees with Sept. in ver. 6 *a*; the Chald. and Syr. substantiate (with slight variations) the masoretic text.—The view taken of the text will depend largely on the decision of the first point.—Some hold the repetition in the Heb. of ver. 6 and ver. 7 to be unmeaning, and therefore adopt the Sept., out of which they endeavor to explain the MSS. text as a corruption (Ew., Böttch., Then., Wellh., who all differ somewhat in their restorations of the original text). Others regard the repetition as a characteristic of Heb. historical narration, and take the Sept. in ver. 6 as a corruption or an explanatory paraphrase (Keil [who cites Königsfeld], Philippson, Erdmann, *Bib.-Com.*). A middle view seems preferable: the repetition seems unnecessary; but the corruption of the Sept. text into the masoretic is improbable. It is therefore more natural to suppose that the Heb. contains two different accounts of the same fact put together by the editor, and that the Sept. either represents a different text or is a corruption of the masoretic.—The following are some of the restorations attempted. Thenius:

8 them away through the plain all night. And they brought the head of Ishbosheth
unto David to Hebron,[7] and said to the king, Behold the head of Ishbosheth the
son of Saul thine enemy, which [who] sought thy life; and the Lord [Jehovah]
hath avenged my lord the king this day of Saul and of his seed.

II. *Punishment of Ishbosheth's Murderers by David.* Vers. 9–12.

9 And David answered Rechab and Baanah his brother, the sons of Rimmon the
Beerothite, and said unto them, As the Lord [Jehovah] liveth, who hath redeemed
10 my soul out of all adversity, When one [He[8] who] told me, saying, Behold Saul
is dead, thinking to have brought good tidings—I took hold of him and slew him
in Ziklag, who *thought* that I would have given [in Ziklag, to give him[9]] a reward
11 for his tidings; How much more when wicked men have slain a righteous person
in his own house upon his bed? shall I not therefore now [and now, shall I not]
require his blood of your hand, and take you away [destroy you] from the earth?[10]
12 And David commanded his [the] young men, and they slew them and cut off their
hands and their feet, and hanged them up over [at][11] the pool in Hebron. But
[And] they took the head of Ishbosheth and buried it in the sepulchre of Abner
in Hebron.

III. *David anointed King over Israel.* Ch. V. 1–5.

1 Then came all the tribes of Israel [And all . . . came] to David unto Hebron,
2 and spake,[12] saying, Behold, we are thy bone and thy flesh. Also in time past,
when Saul was king over us, thou wast he that leddest [led][13] out and broughtest
[brought] in Israel; and the Lord [Jehovah] said to thee, Thou shalt feed my
3 people Israel, and thou shalt be a [*om.* a] captain over Israel. So [And] all
the elders of Israel came to the king to Hebron, and king David made a league
[covenant] with them in Hebron before the Lord [Jehovah], and they anointed
4 David king over Israel. David was thirty years old when he began to reign, *and*[14]
5 he reigned forty years. In Hebron he reigned over Judah seven years and six
months, and in Jerusalem he reigned thirty and three years over all Israel and
Judah.

וְהִנֵּה פֹּקֶדֶת דֶּלֶת הַבַּיִת לֹקֶטֶת חִטִּים וַתָּנָם וַתִּישַׁן וְרֵכָב וּבַעֲנָה אָחִיו נִמְלָטוּ, "and behold the female overseer of the door of the house was gathering wheat, and nodded [slumbered] and slept. And Rechab and Baanah his brother (came) unperceived (into the house)." But the Greek has "cleansing," not "gathering" wheat, and it is not easy to construct the masoretic text out of this. Böttcher: וְהִנֵּה הַשּׁוֹעֶרֶת תּוֹךְ הַבַּיִת לְקֹחַת חִטִּים וַנָּמָה הוּא תַרְדֵּמָה וְרֵכָב וגו׳, and behold, the portress (was) within the house to cleanse wheat, and she had slumbered and slept; and Rechab and Baanah had slipped through." He introduces a verb קחח, "to purify," from the Arabic, and does not account for the Heb.: "smote him in the underbody."—Ewald adopts Thenius' reading except that he puts אֲשֶׁר עַל for the Heb. בָּאוּ עַד, and instead of לקט writes סקל. Wellhausen: וְהִנֵּה שׁוֹעֶרֶת הַבַּיִת סֹקְלָה ח׳, "and behold, the portress of the house was stoning wheat," where the סקל makes a difficulty.—If the suggestion made above be adopted, we may take the masoretic text as the original (though a blending of two contemporary accounts), and then with the help of these emendations explain the emergence of the Sept. text from it.—Tr.]

7 [Ver. 8. Acc. of limit. Three MSS. prefix the prep. בְּ, "in."—Tr.]

8 [Ver. 10. Partcp. as preposed absolute Nominative.—Tr.]

9 [Ver. 10. Lit.: "who (or, which) for my giving to him [the reward of] tidings." Hence three renderings: 1) "which (namely, the slaying him) was to give him;" 2) "to whom I should have given;" 3) "who thought that I would have given him." The first is simplest and strongest (so Bottch., Cahen, Philipps., Keil, Erdmann). The second is that of the Sept. and Vulg. The third is adopted by Chald. and Eng. A. V. The Syr. has (in the simplifying style it so often adopts): "instead of giving him."—בְּשֹׂרָה, "good tidings," here stands for "reward of good tidings."—Tr.]

10 [Ver. 11. Or: "from the land" (Böttcher, Erdmann), a more distinctively Israelitish conception.—Tr.]

11 [Ver. 12. עַל in the sense of "on, at" (ἐπί with Dat.).—Tr.]

12 [Ch. v. 1. Lit.: "said, saying," at which repetition offence has been taken, but improperly, since it is genuine Heb. (though rare), comp. Ex. xv. 1; 2 Sam. xx. 18.—The first word is omitted in 1 Chron. xi. 1 and in the Vulg.; the second by two MSS., Sept., Syr., Ar. After וַיֹּאמְרוּ some MSS., Sept., Syr., Ar., insert לוֹ, "to him."—Tr.]

13 [Ver. 2. Eng. A. V. is here ungrammatical. The sentence would now more naturally read: "it was thou that leddest."—Remove the final ה from הָיְתָה, and prefix it (as Art.) to the following word, as the masoretic note suggests. Comp. 1 Chron. xi. 2—Tr.]

14 [Ver. 4. The "and" is found in several MSS. and VSS., a natural interpolation.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

I. Chap. IV. 1–8. *Murder of Ishbosheth.*

Ver. 1. In consequence of the news of Abner's murder, Ishbosheth's hands became "*slack*," the opposite of the "strong" (חָזָק) comp. ii. 7; xvi. 21—that is, he completely lost heart. **And all Israel was troubled**, because people knew Ishbosheth's incapacity, and that Abner alone had been the prop of his kingdom (iii. 6). [Things were generally in an unsettled state. Patrick: By Abner's death the treaty with David was broken off, or there was nobody to manage it like Abner; Plato observes: "when any calamity is about to befall a city, God is wont to take away (the) excellent men out of that city."—Tr.].—Ver. 2. **The son of Saul had* two band-leaders, Baanah and Rechab, sons of Rimmon.**—Noteworthy is the designation "son of Saul" for Ishbosheth, who is never called "the Anointed of the Lord."—The two "band-leaders" in Ishbosheth's service were no doubt bold, adventurous men. The part that they play, as well as Abner's conduct, suggests the supposition that the firm military organization that Saul had called into being had relaxed, and a disintegration of the army into separate bodies under adventurers and partisans was imminent, if it had not already occurred. **Of the sons of Benjamin; for Beeroth also was reckoned to† Benjamin.**—*Beeroth*, according to *Rob.* II. 345 sq. [Am. Ed. i. 451–453, ii. 262] and Later Bibl. Researches 190 [Am. Ed. III. 289], the present village Bireh, seven miles north of Jerusalem in an unfruitful and stony region on a mountain, with old foundations, not far from Gibeon on the western border of Benjamin. Comp. Josh. ix. 17; xviii. 25. As from its border-position, it might easily be reckoned to another tribe, it is here expressly mentioned as belonging to Benjamin, that there might be no doubt that these murderers were really Benjaminites, fellow-tribesmen of Saul's son.—Ver. 3. An explanatory statement about Beeroth with reference to the time of the narrator, when that Beeroth was no longer in existence. Not: "they had fled" (for at the time of Ishbosheth's murder Beeroth no longer existed), but: "they fled to *Gittaim.*" They dwelt there as *strangers* (גָּרִים) not *protégés* (against Ewald, Then.). Neither the reason for their flight, nor the position of this place is known to us. In Neh. xi. 33 a Gittaim is mentioned among the places inhabited by Benjaminites after the Exile. If that is the same with our Gittaim, we yet cannot certainly conclude that it belonged to Benjamin *before* the Exile; the contrary rather is probable. The word "strangers" points to the fact that the fugitive Beerothites dwelt there among *non-Israelites*. It was perhaps one of the places on the border of Benjamin belonging to the non-Israelitish Amoritic Gibeonites. [Patrick and Philippson suggest that Beeroth was abandoned by its inhabitants at the time of the Philistine invasion, 1 Sam. xxxi. 7. *Bib.-Com.* (supposing the Beerothites to be Gibeonites) conjectures that the flight was occasioned by Saul's attack, 2 Sam. xxi. 1, 2, and that the act of Baanah and Rechab was one of vengeance.—But we know nothing certainly about it.—Gittaim has been supposed to be the Philistine Gath (Then. and others) or Gath-Rimmon, Josh. xix. 45; xxi. 24 (Wellh.).—Tr.].—Ver. 4. A historical remark in respect to the then condition of Saul's house. Its only representative besides Ishbosheth was Jonathan's son *Mephibosheth*, five years old at the time of the catastrophe at Jezreel, lame in both feet, helpless therefore, and neither a support to Ishbosheth nor fit to succeed him on the throne. In view of this the narrator here inserts this statement in order to make clear how, on the murder of Ishbosheth related below, the kingdom of Saul's house was necessarily extinguished. For further notices of Mephibosheth see ix., xvi. 1 sq.; xix. 25 sq. Instead of this name we find (parallel with Eshbaal for Ishbosheth—see on ii. 8) in 1 Chron. viii. 34; ix. 40, *Meribbaal* = "opponent, conqueror of Baal," and Mephibosheth* also perhaps means "exterminator of Baal." [This statement about Mephibosheth also prepares the way for the subsequent notices of him.—Tr.].—Ver. 5. "In the heat of the day" the murderers came to *Mahanaim* where Ishbosheth dwelt, see ii. 8. **He lay on the midday-bed**, that is, in a quiet, remote, cool spot of the house. They chose this time of midday-rest as favorable to their purpose.—Ver. 6. "And hither."† The phrase "fetching wheat" explains how they could penetrate "into the *midst* of the house," where Ishbosheth was lying; they came as persons that wished or were directed to fetch wheat. The Particp. is sometimes put for the Impf. as our Fut., as Ex. x. 8, "who are they that are going?" (= that purpose going), and so in narration does the duty of the Pret., as Gen. xix. 14, "marrying his daughter" (= who were to or wished to marry). Ewald, § 335 *b*. They came not as "purchasers of wheat" (Buns.), but as band-leaders, to get wheat for the support of their men, "corn [grain] to divide out to their soldiers, which was kept in the middle of Ishbosheth's house" (Cler.). We need not suppose that this was merely a pretext; rather their entrance into the midst of the house is the more easily explained when we suppose that this was a usual practice in accordance with their military position, and that they had done it before. Thus without attracting attention they could slay Ishbosheth, and quickly make their escape.—The Sept., departing completely from the Masoretic text, here reads: "and behold, the portress of the house was cleansing wheat and had fallen asleep and slumbered; and Rechab and Baanah, the brothers, escaped (or, slipped by)." Thenius' restoration of the original text after the Sept. is rejected by Böttcher as "frightfully far" from the masoretic text, while Thenius disapproves Böttcher's reading (which Ewald with some modifi-

* It is necessary to supply לְ (but not לְאִישׁ־בֹּשֶׁת) before בֶּן־שָׁאוּל.

† עַל — "on to," "to."

* בֹּשֶׁת for בַּעַל and מְפִי from פָּאָה "scatter" (only Hiph., Deut. xxxii. 26, Sept. διασπερῶ αὐτούς, and so Ar., Chald.)

† It is unnecessary (with Ges. § 121, 6, Rem. 1) to take הֵנָּה as Pron. fem. for masc.; we may render "hither" (Maur.), or point הִנֵּה "behold."

cations adopts) as more circumstantial than his own. If the original text accorded with these conjectures, it is not easy to see how the present masoretic text (which differs from it so much) came from it, while it is easy to suppose that the Sept. (according to its custom), tried by an interpretation to explain partly how the two murderers could get into the house unopposed, partly the strange repetition of the account in ver. 7. The Vulg. (which, through the **Itala** on which it is based, is dependent on the Sept.) has the corresponding insertion: "and the portress of the house cleansing wheat fell asleep," while in the rest of the verse it follows the masoretic text against the Sept. All the other ancient versions follow the Heb. According to the latter there is certainly a tautology in vers. 6, 7, the entrance into the house and the murder being twice mentioned. But in the first place, it is to be observed that in the attempted restorations of the original text the phrase "came into the house" remains in ver. 5 and ver. 7. But we must further bear in mind a peculiarity of Heb. narration (referred to by Königsfeld, *Annot. ad post. libr. Sam.*, and Keil), by which a previously-mentioned fact is repeated in order to add something new. So in iii. 22, 23 the coming of Joab, and in v. 1, 8 the coming of the Tribes is twice mentioned. Here the "coming" of ver. 5 is more fully described in ver. 6, and the "slaying" of ver. 6 is defined in ver. 7 as *beheading*, and this makes the transition to the account in ver. 8, that the murderers brought the *head* of Ishbosheth to David, having during the night traversed the Arabah or plain of the Jordan. Comp. ii. 29.—Ver. 8. **To the king.**—Notice that David is always here so termed, while in respect to Ishbosheth the title is avoided. **Behold the head of thy enemy, who sought thy life.**—The better to justify their deed, and to gain favor and reward from David, the risen star, they stigmatize Ishbosheth as one that sought after David's life, thinking perhaps that the recollection of Saul's persecution and Abner's hostility would give the color of truth to their false assertion. [Others hold less well that *Saul* is the enemy here meant.—Tr.]. Nothing is said in the history of attempts on David's life by Ishbosheth, and David's designation of him as a "righteous man," who was guilty of no evil deed stamps that assertion as a lie. They have the effrontery indeed to represent their crime as an act or judgment of God, the better to commend themselves to David, though they had committed the murder of their own accord without any commission at all.

II. Vers. 9-12. *Punishment of Ishbosheth's murderers by David.*

Ver. 9. The words: **Who hath redeemed my soul out of all adversity**—are therefore not a confirmation of the murderers' assertion about Ishbosheth, but contain the thought "that David is not obliged to free himself by crime from his enemies" (Keil).—Ver. 10. **He who told me . . . thinking himself a messenger of good**—a recapitulation of the history of the Amalekite (ch. i.), here put in the absolute construction, and the words **and I seized him** follow as principal assertion, instead of: "*if* I seized and slew him who told me" (ch. i. 15). "In order to give him a reward for his tidings," that is, to inflict on him the punishment he deserved.* [See "Text. and Gram." The last clause of this verse is of the nature of biting irony—David gave the man a reward, and it was death.—Tr.].—Ver. 11. "How much more!" (אַף כִּי) the apodosis to the protasis in ver. 10. The words: **wicked men . . . on his bed are** (as in ver. 10) proposed in absolute construction, instead of: "how much more shall I require his blood from your hand, ye wicked men!" The "wicked men" stands in sharp contrast with the "righteous man." David characterizes Ishbosheth as a "righteous man," that is, as one who had never done anything wicked (so Josephus). This judgment accords with the character given of Ishbosheth in chaps. ii., iii. (he was a "good man," without falsehood and blameless), and is at the same time a decided refutation of the charge by which the murderers think to palliate their crime. "David declares that Ishbosheth was blameless, having done nothing to occasion this end" (Cassel). With the phrase "and now" David brings his speech to a close, pronouncing sentence of death, by the same royal authority as in i. 14, 15. The form of the thought is a progression from the less to the greater: If I executed in Ziklag him who avowed having killed at his own request on the battle-field my adversary Saul, under whose persecutions the Lord delivered me from all adversity, how much more must I demand at your hands the blood of this *righteous* man whom ye murderously slew in his *house* on his *bed*. On the phrase "require blood," see Gen. ix. 5, according to which God Himself is the avenger of blood, comp. Ps. ix. 13. David recognizes himself as king in God's service and His instrument, when he causes these criminals to be slain in expiation of intentional homicide. Comp. Num. xxxv. 31.—"Take away, destroy;" the verb (בִּעֵר) is used of extermination by death, for example, in Deut. xiii. 6 (5); not "from the earth," but "from the land" (אֶרֶץ), since according to the law (Num. xxxv. 33), the murderer lost his abode in the land of promise.—Ver. 12. The order for execution is given and carried out. It is specially severe in two points: the *dismemberment* of the corpses by cutting off hands and feet, the deepest indignity, and the *hanging up* of the mutilated corpses at the pool in Hebron, a place where many persons came and went; this was for a public testimony to David's righteous severity against such evil-doers, as well as his innocence of the murder, and for a terrible example, comp. Deut. xxi. 21, 22. [Hands and feet were cut off because these were the offending members (Abarb. in Philippson). This sort of punishment has always been common in the East.—Tr.].—David had "Ishbosheth's head" buried in "Abner's sepulchre in Hebron" on account of the relation that had existed between the two men.

III. Vers. 1–5. *David anointed king over all Israel.*

Ver. 1. These incidents (the murder of Abner and that of Ishbosheth), which made a deep impression on the whole people, taken in connection with the growing inclination to David in all Is-

* The initial כִּי introduces the discourse. The אֲשֶׁר in the last clause = ὅτι (Ew. § 338 *b*) introducing the following words.

rael, necessarily favored and hastened the attainment of the end after which Abner had striven in his negotiations with the elders (iii. 17, 18). The tenor of the history leads us to hold with Ewald that the recognition of David as king over all Israel occurred immediately after Ishbosheth's death, against Stähelin, who thinks that there was an interval of several years after his death, during which the tribes gradually came over to David. [Here the Book of Chronicles again falls in with our history (1 Chron. xi.), and runs parallel with it in general (though with many differences) to the end of David's life. The differences will be noticed as they present themselves. —Tr.].—Thus, then, appear at Hebron "all the tribes of Israel," that is, the elders (ver. 3) of all the tribes except Judah. The elders give three reasons (arranged in order of importance) for raising David to the throne over the whole nation: 1) **Behold, we are thy bone and thy flesh.**—This expression denotes blood-relationship in the family, Gen. xxix. 14; Judg. ix. 2; it here refers to their common descent from one ancestor: "we are thy kinsmen by blood," in view of which the enmity between us must cease. —Ver. 2. 2) **Before, when Saul reigned over us, it was thou that leddest Israel out and in**—the same thing is said of Joshua in Num. xxvii. 17. The expression "lead out and in" does not refer to the *affairs* of Israel (Keil), but the *people itself* ("Israel"), and "the whole people" indeed. This is expressly affirmed in 1 Sam. xviii. 16 in the words: "And all Israel and Judah loved David, because he went out and in before them," and that this "going out and in" is to be understood of military leadership is clear from ver. 5, ver. 13, and from the whole connection. The bond of fellowship and love, which had bound him to them (even under Saul) as leader in their military undertakings, is the second ground of their proposal.—3) Their last and strongest ground is *the immediate call by the word of the Lord to be shepherd and prince over Israel.* **And the Lord said to thee**; on the word "feed" (רָעָה) see Ps. lxxviii. 70–72, and on "prince" [captain] see 1 Sam. xxv. 30. No such word of the Lord, spoken immediately to David, is ever mentioned. The declaration of the elders is to be explained as Abigail's in 1 Sam. xxv. 30, and Abner's in 2 Sam. iii. 9, 18 [that is, as belonging to the circle of prophetic thought.—Tr.]. It is perhaps based on the *word of the Lord* to Samuel, 1 Sam. xvi. 1, 2, by which David was chosen to be king over Israel, comp. with 1 Sam. xv. 28.—The first and third grounds answer exactly to the precept in Deut. xvii. 15: "Thou shalt make him king over thee whom *the Lord thy God shall choose;* out of the midst of *thy brethren* shalt thou make a king over thee." [Patrick: Ver. 1. They were not overcome by the arms, but by the piety and justice of David, to acknowledge him their king.—Ver. 2. This is the first time we find a governor described in Scripture as pastor of the people; afterwards the name is much used by the prophets, particularly Ezek. xxxiv. 23 and many other places. Whence our Lord Christ is called "the good Shepherd" and "the great Shepherd."—Evil rulers are called "roaring lions, hungry bears, and devouring wolves," *etc.*, Ez. xix. 2.—Comp. the Homeric epithet ποιμένες λαῶν, and the emblematic animals in Dante's *Inferno. Bk.* I.—Tr.].—Ver. 3. **And the elders . . came to Hebron**—resumption of the words of ver. 1 with exacter definition of the expression "tribes" by the mention of their representatives "the elders," for the purpose of further detailing the solemn *covenanting* of David with the people and his *anointing* as king of Israel. **And king David made a covenant with them before the Lord.**—Comp. iii. 21, "that they may make a covenant with thee." In this word of Abner is given *one side* of the covenant, namely, the obligating of the people to obey him as the king given them by the Lord; here the *other side* is given, namely, David promises in this covenant, in accordance with his divine choice and call to the throne, to rule the people according to the will of the Lord. Notice the expression of the Heb. "made *to them* a covenant" (כָּרַת לְ), which does not permit us to regard this as a mere bargain, wherein both parties have equal rights and authority" (Œhler, *Herz.* VIII. 11). The relation of both parties to *the Lord* is indicated by the expression "*before.*" The view that an *agreement* was here entered into of the nature of a modern constitution* (Then.), does not accord with the relation that the theocratic principle of the Davidic kingdom established between king and people in their common obligation to the Lord, the true king of His people. **And they anointed David king over Israel**—to which the Chronicler adds (1 Chr. xi. 3): "according to the word of the Lord by Samuel," an explanatory addition referring to the Lord's command to Samuel to anoint David king over Israel, 1 Sam. xvi. 1, 12. David's anointing by Samuel (1 Sam. xvi.) is now confirmed by the anointing of the people, they having expressly and solemnly recognized his divine call to be king of Israel (1 Sam. xv. 28), made by Samuel and witnessed by Samuel's anointing. The Chronicler, deriving his information from precise accounts, declares that there was a large attendance of military men from the whole nation at this royal festival (1 Chr. xii. 23–40).—Vers. 4, 5. The statement in ii. 11 is here resumed, and we have stated, 1) David's age (30 years) at his accession to the throne; 2) the whole time of his reign (40 years), and 3) the time of his reign over Israel (33 years). See on ii. 11. These statements of time are given in 1 Chr. xxix. 27 at the close of David's reign. [*Bib. Com.:* The age of David (30 years) shows that the events narrated from 1 Sam. xiii. to the end of the book did not occupy above 10 years—four years in Saul's service, four years of wandering, one year and four months among the Philistines, and a few months after Saul's death.—Tr.]

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. In the section chap. iv.—v. 5 we have the completed fulfilment of the statement made in

* [There was probably gradually established between king and people some recognition of mutual rights and duties—an unwritten, or possibly in part a written law. This would not be out of harmony with the theocratic conception of the government. Philippson points out some apparent indications (as 1 Kings xii.) of such a law.—Tr.]

iii. 1 concerning the theocratically contrasted fortunes of Saul's house and David, up to the culmination of the latter's rise and the uttermost point of the former's depression. The spiritual weakness, moral slackness and personal insignificance of Saul's heir on the throne, the unfaithfulness, ambition, selfishness, rude violence and dissolution of all discipline and order about the royal court, the increasing favor of the people to David and the entire absence of prospect for the physical maintenance of the kingdom in Saul's house, whose last scion was a cripple—all this co-operated to bring about the fall of this kingdom before the eyes of the people and the fulfilment of the divine judgment on Saul's house, without David's doing the slightest thing to produce the catastrophe or staining his hands with Ishbosheth's blood, holding, as he did, to what he had sworn to Saul, 1 Sam. xxiv. 22, 23. Amid the affecting events that introduce the final fall of Saul's house, and the severe temptations with which he is beset to make a compact with sin, or at least to come in contact with crime in order to gain his end, David holds, as from the beginning, firm and unshaken to his stand-point of humble obedience to and complete dependence on the will and leading of the Lord, knowing himself to be in person and life and in his destination for the throne of Israel solely in the hand of God. The anger with which he repels self-commending crime [iv. 8–11], appealing to the guidance of his God who had brought him through all adversity, is at the same time a positive witness to his determination to take all further steps also up to the attainment of his promised dominion only at the hand of his God, and to guard against all tainting of his divine mission by sin and crime. "His way to the throne had hitherto been always the way of obedience to God's will; it was ever the way of the fear of God and of conscientious fulfilment of duty, and with such crimes he had never had anything to do. How could he now defile himself with them! The execution of these two murderers was a testimony to all the people, what ways David went and wished further to go, and that whoever would avail anything with this king, must tread solely the path of godly fear and duty" (Schlier).

2. Ishbosheth's violent end is not to be regarded as a natural step in the fall of Saul's house, or as a necessary consequence thereof, but as a revelation of the divine justice against his guilt in permitting himself (by his good-nature and moral weakness) to be misused by his ambitious and high-aiming general Abner, to be made a rival king and seduced into hostile undertakings against David (ii. 12). Such an end must Ishbosheth's kingdom according to the divine justice have had, since it was founded on opposition to God's will.

3. And so, in respect to God's judgments on men's sins, the God-fearing man, like David, with all his holy anger against evil, which is a reflection of God's holy anger, and with all his obligatory energy of punitive justice, must yet exhibit recognition of the good that exists in his neighbor who is smitten by the judgment of God, and especially cherish gentleness and forbearance where personal wrong has been done him.

4. The *covenant*, which David made with the people on his accession to the throne, is not to be thought of as a contract between two parties, who by negotiations and mutual concessions produce a constitutional relation, in which their *mutual* rights and duties are to be considered and carried out.—This would be directly contradictive of the fundamental idea of Israel's constitution, namely, that the God of the fathers, who had *chosen* the people, separated them to be *His* people, redeemed them from the bondage of Egypt, and made a law-covenant with them at Sinai, was their *king*, and that they owed Him obedience as their ruler according to the demands of His law. *People* and God-given *king* had to obey *the Lord* as their proper, true king; there is no contrasting of king and people, but both have to render unconditional obedience to the invisible God as their Lord and Ruler. See 1 Sam. xii. 20–25. The conviction that David was called *immediately* by *the Lord* to be king of Israel had spread from Samuel and the prophets throughout the nation, and announced itself expressly in the formal and solemn recognition of David as king in accordance with the demand in Deut. xvii. 15: "Thou shalt set as king over thee him whom the Lord thy God shall choose." This recognition of the divine call precedes the covenanting and the anointing. On the basis, now, of this recognized fact, the covenanting could include nothing but what followed necessarily from the principle of the theocratic kingdom, to govern the people in the name of the Lord, and according to the law that the invisible King of the people had given. David promised, in accordance with Dt. xvii. 19, 20, faithfully to perform the law given by the Lord for him as well as for the people, and not merely a constitutional law agreed on between him and the people; and the people promised to obey the Lord their God in His royal government, and to be subject to David as God-appointed instrument of the theocracy. [While this statement of the joint subordination of king and people to the divine law is perfectly just, so that there could not be in Israel a political constitution, political progress, or free institutions according to modern conceptions, we may still suppose that in carrying out the details of the government there came to be recognized certain principles (subordinate to the central principle) which controlled the customary action of sovereign and people, and were of the nature of Common Law or a Constitution.—Tr.].

5. *The establishment of David on the throne of Israel as an act of God* (completed by the people, in the knowledge and recognition of God's will, by the anointment as an act of choice and homage) restored externally and internally on the old deep theocratic basis, the *unity* of the people introduced by Samuel, which was gradually weakened under Saul's government, and after his death destroyed by the division of the nation into two parts and the establishment of two kingdoms, so that a recurrence of the disintegration of the Period of the Judges was imminent. The *perfect unity* of all the tribes shows itself at David's anointment in Hebron, 1) in the avowal of the *blood-relationship* of the whole people with David through their common descent from one ancestor

—in contrast with the nations that were corporally foreign to them (comp. Deut. xvii. 15); 2) in the recognition of David's services to the whole nation even in Saul's time as military leader against foreign nations, and of the bond of love and confidence that consequently bound the whole people to him; 3) in the declaration that David was called by the Lord Himself to be king over all Israel (comp. Deut. xvii. 15), and 4) in the covenant that the two, king and people, make with one another before the Lord as their King, on the basis of the law-covenant that God had made with His people (comp. Deut. xvii. 19, 20, with 1 Sam. xii. 20 sq., and Ex. xix., xx.)

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1 sq. *Cursed is the man that trusteth in man*, and maketh flesh his arm, 1) Because of the *frailty* of all flesh and of all human supports, with which fall the hopes based on them. 2) Because of the *faithlessness* of men, in whom blind confidence is placed instead of putting all confidence in the faithfulness of the Lord. 3) Because of the *danger of ruin* of body and soul, to which one thereby exposes himself.—Ver. 8. *How evil seeks deceitfully to clothe itself with the appearance of good*, 1) by *falsehood*, in alleging something evil in others as a pretext to make itself appear right and good; 2) by *hypocrisy*, in representing itself as in harmony with *God's* Word and will; 3) by the *pretence* of having promoted the interest of another.

Vers. 8–12. *How the children of God should guard against the power of evil which presses upon them.* 1) By repulsing every service of evil that is to their advantage, and pointing to the Lord who alone is their help. 2) By avoiding all participation in others' guilt. 3) By energetically testifying, in word and deed, against evil.

Chap. V. 3. *What kingdom is in truth a kingdom by the grace of God?* That which, 1) is based on the solid *ground* of the word and will of God; 2) conducts its *government* only in the name and service of the living God, fulfilling its office of shepherd and leader, and 3) strives after the *welfare of the people* only in the covenant of love and obedience towards the holy and gracious God.

Ver. 1. STARKE: Let no one trust in men, Jer. xvii. 5; for they are nothing, Psa. lxii. 10 [9], and when they fall, all hope falls, too, Psa. cxlvi. 3, 4.—S. SCHMID: At last the will of God does come to pass, and His promises go on to their fulfilment, Rom. iv. 21; Heb. ii. 3.

[Ver. 2. SCOTT: Wretched indeed are they who are engaged in undertakings in which none can serve them without opposing the known will of God! The more exalted their station, the greater is their danger; for the very men in whom they repose their chief confidence are destitute of principle, serve them only for gain, and will betray or murder them when their mercenary schemes require it.—TR.].—Vers. 2, 3. BERL. B.: A true king is nothing else than the shepherd of the people, vii. 7; Psa. lxxviii. 71, 72. Accordingly God made David a shepherd of men, as Peter a fisher of men.—Ver. 3. STARKE: God causes His own people, whom He wishes to exalt, first to come under the cross awhile, Prov. xiii. 12.—S. SCHMID: Kings and princes must know that they stand under God, according to whose will and direction they have to judge themselves.—WUERT. B.: Although God does not cause that which He has promised the pious, to come to them immediately, yet He does at least give it to them, and indeed the longer He delays the more glorious it becomes. So let men patiently wait for the right time.

Ver. 4. OSIANDER: What often seems most hurtful to us, must often be most helpful to us.—WUERT. B.: When God with His grace turns away from a man or a whole race, there is then no more prosperity, but all gradually goes down.—Ver. 8. CRAMER: Ungodly men boast of their trickery and villainy, and imagine they will thereby gain praise, and glory in their sin.—BERL. B.: They wish, as it were, to spread the name of God and His Providence as a mantle over their knavery, as bad boys are wont to do.—[WORDSWORTH: It has been often so in the history of the world and of the Church, where zeal for God is sometimes a color for worldly ambition, and an occasion for deeds of cruelty and treachery.—TR.].—SCHLIER: Where is there a human heart that knows nothing of selfishness? O do let us recognize such an enemy in ourselves, and humble ourselves therefor, do let us all our days fight against the enemy with real earnestness! Either thou slayest selfishness or it slays thee, and plunges thee into sin and shame, and thereby into ruin and damnation. It was selfishness that made these two Benjaminites become murderers of their king.—[Ver. 8. SCOTT: Many are conscious that *they* should be pleased with villainy, provided it conduced greatly to their profit: thus they are led confidently to conclude that others will be so too; and as numbers are rewarded for villainous actions, they expect the same.—TR.]

Vers. 9–11. To hate and avoid sin is to be prudent, to keep out of sneaking ways is to build one's fortune, and to put away from us even enticing offers that are not in accordance with duty and the fear of God is to be sensible for time and eternity.—Ver. 9. CRAMER: True Christians should commit and commend all their affairs to God, who judges righteously; He can and will make all well, 1 Pet. ii. 23; Ps. xxxvii. 5.—Ver. 10. CRAMER: God-fearing rulers should not bring territory and people to them through treachery, assassination, unfaithfulness, apostasy from known truth, hypocrisy and such like villainous tricks; for to be pious and true will alone protect the king, and his throne is established by righteousness, Prov. xx. 28.

[Ver. 11. HENRY: Charity teaches us to make the best, not only of our friends but of our enemies, and to think those may be righteous persons who yet in some instances do us wrong.—Chap. V. 1. WORDSWORTH: And thus God overruled evil for good, and brought good out of evil. He made the crimes of Abner, Joab, and of the two Beerothites to be subservient to the exaltation of David, and the establishment of his kingdom over all Israel. Thus God will make all the sins of evil men to be one day ministerial to the extension and final settlement of the universal dominion of Christ.—TR.]

[Ver. 1. When the sudden death of one man completely disheartens a whole people, it shows that he was a great man, but also that the people were already in an evil condition. And this man

who seemed the prop of everything, may have long been in fact delaying some grand Providential destiny.—Tr.]

[Ver. 4. Sunday-school address, *The little lame prince.* His lameness was produced under very sad circumstances, was itself a sad calamity, and seemed to cut him off from a great career. Yet it afterwards preserved his life, and brought him wealth and honor (ch. ix.). Let us not conclude that the afflicted or unfortunate have no future. Let us remember how often Providence turns calamity into blessing.—Tr.]

[Vers. 5–12. Sunday-school address, *The assassins.* Describe them walking rapidly all night along the plain of the Jordan, bearing the slain king's head. 1) Their foul deed, vers. 6, 7, 11. 2) Their false pretences, ver. 8. 3) Their deserved and terrible fate, ver. 12. Reflections: The sacredness of human life—trickery often fails—it is a shame to claim God's sanction for wickedness—men becoming immortal by their crimes alone.—Tr.]

[Ver. 9. *Memory of past deliverances by the Lord.* 1) Inspiring gratitude. 2) Restraining from sin. 3) Cheering with hope. (Each may be richly illustrated by David's circumstances when he uttered the text).—Tr.]

[Chap. V. 4. *How has David reached the throne?* 1) By aspiring to it only because divinely appointed. 2) By deserving it *a*) in what he did; *b*) in what he refused to do. 3) By waiting for it, *a*) continuing patient through a long course of trials; *b*) using all lawful means in his power to gain it (*e. g.*, ii. 5; iii. 20, 36); *c*) preparing for it, consciously and unconsciously, learning how to rule men, and to overcome difficulties.—Tr.]

SECOND DIVISION.

DAVID KING OVER ALL ISRAEL.

Chap. V. 6—XIV. 25.

FIRST SECTION.

David's reign at its culmination and greatest splendor.

Chapter V. 6—X. 19.

I. ITS GLORIOUS ESTABLISHMENT AND CONFIRMATION.

Chapter V. 6—VI. 23.

A.—WITHOUT: 1) BY THE VICTORY OVER THE JEBUSITES AND THE CONQUEST OF THE CITADEL OF ZION, IN CONSEQUENCE OF WHICH JERUSALEM BECOMES THE CAPITAL CITY OF THE KINGDOM. Vers. 6–16. 2) BY TWO VICTORIES OVER THE PHILISTINES. Vers. 17–25.

I. *The victory over the Jebusites and the conquest of the citadel of Zion.* Vers. 6–16.

6 And the king[1] and his men went to Jerusalem unto the Jebusites, the inhabitants
of the land. Which [And they] spake unto David, saying, Except[2] thou take away
the blind and the lame, thou shalt not come in hither; thinking [saying], David

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 6. Instead of "king" we find "David" in several MSS., in Sept., and in 1 Chr. xi. 4, and "king David" in Syr., Ar.; we can feel the differences that these readings make in the tone of the narrative, but it is hardly possible to decide which of them is original.—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 6. Eng. A. V. has here unnecessarily inverted the clauses; read: "thou shalt not come in hither except, *etc.*;" so Sym., Chald., Syr., Vulg., pointing הָסִירְךָ as Inf. But others point it Perf. plu. הֱסִירֻךָ and render: "thou shalt not come in hither, but (כִּי אִם) the blind and the lame will keep thee away" (Sept., Then., Bötch., Wellh., Bib.-Com., Erdmann and others), which rendering (making "the blind and the lame" the subject of the sentence) Philippson declares to be unnecessary and ungrammatical. The sentence presents serious grammatical difficulties: on the one hand the כִּי אִם requires a finite verb after it (when a noun follows it, it is always as object of a preceding verb, which the Inf. cannot here be), on the other hand the verb should here be Impf. (Philippson's difficulty is not serious). The difficulty might be removed by prefixing בְּ to the Infin. (so Symm.,

7 cannot [shall not] come in hither. Nevertheless [And] David took the stronghold
8 of Zion; the same is the city of David. And David said on that day, Whosoever[3]
getteth up to the gutter, and smiteth the Jebusites, and the lame and the blind that
are hated of David's soul, *he shall be chief and captain.* Wherefore they said [say],
9 The blind and the lame shall not come into the house. So [And] David dwelt in
the fort [stronghold], and called it the city of David. And David built[4] round
10 about from Millo and inward. And David went on and grew great [David kept
growing greater and greater], and the Lord God [Jehovah the God] of hosts was
with him.

11 And Hiram king of Tyre sent messengers to David, and cedar trees and carpen-
12 ters and masons; and they built David an house. And David perceived that the
Lord [Jehovah] had established him king over Israel, and that he had exalted[5] his
kingdom for his people Israel's sake.

13 And David took him more concubines and wives out of Jerusalem, after he was
14 come from Hebron; and there were yet sons and daughters born to David. And
these be [are] the names of those that were born unto him in Jerusalem: Shammuah
15 [Shammua] and Shobab and Nathan and Solomon, Ibhar also [And Ibhar] and
16 Elishua and Nepheg and Japhia, And Elishama and Eliada and Eliphalet.

2. *David's two victories over the Philistines.* Vers. 17–25.

17 But when [And] the Philistines heard that they had anointed David king over
Israel, [*ins.* and] all the Philistines came up to seek David; and David heard of
18 it, and went down[6] to the hold. The Philistines also [And the Philistines] came and
19 spread themselves in the valley of Rephaim. And David enquired of the Lord [Je-
hovah], saying, Shall I go up to the Philistines? wilt thou deliver them into mine
hand? And the Lord [Jehovah] said unto David, Go up; for I will doubtless
20 [certainly] deliver the Philistines into thine hand. And David came to Baal-pera-
zim,[7] and David smote them there, and said, The Lord [Jehovah] hath broken forth
upon [broken asunder] mine enemies before me as the breach of waters. Therefore
21 he called the name of that place Baal-perazim. And there they left [they left
there] their images,[8] and David and his men burned them [took them away].

22 And the Philistines came up yet again, and spread themselves in the valley of
23 Rephaim. And when [*om.* when] David enquired of the Lord [Jehovah], [*ins.* and]

Chald.), or by reading Perf. 2 sing. masc. הֲסִירֹתָ (so Syr., Vulg. perhaps).—Wellhausen thinks the subjoined explanation ("saying, David shall not, *etc.*") unnecessary (the meaning being clear enough), and therefore hardly original, perhaps a marginal gloss; but it is not merely a repetition, since it puts absolutely what was before put as conditional.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 8. In this sentence there are three points of difficulty: 1) the construction of וְיִגַּע, whether it is to be joined to the preceding protasis, or regarded as beginning the apodosis, that is, whether the whole sentence is to be taken as protasis, the apodosis being omitted (so Then., Philippson, Cohen, Eng. A. V., which supplies the apodosis from 1 Chr. xi. 6), or as containing protasis and apodosis (so Böttch., Ew., Erdmann). 2) The pointing and construction of שְׂנֻאו, and 3) the meaning of צִנּוֹר. For the discussion see the Exposition.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 9. Read after Sept. וַיִּבְנֶהָ "built it" (so Wellh.).–From "Millo" Aq. has ἀπὸ πληρώματος, Sym. ἀπὸ προθέματος (Jerome says that Sym. and Theod. had *adimpletionem*), Sept. ἀπὸ τῆς ἄκρας.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 12. נִשֵּׂא Piel 3 sing. masc.; 1 Chr. xiv. 2 נִשֵּׂאת, Niph. 3 sing. fem. According to Wellh. the final ת in Chr. represents the first מ in the following word in Sam. Which reading is original can hardly be determined.—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 17. 1 Chr. xiv. 8: "And went out before them (= against them)." The Chr. omits the details of the movement, but this does not show that he could not reconcile the "went down" of Sam. with the preceding (against Wellh.). Nor is there any good reason why the same narrator should not apply the same word (מְצוּדָה "hold") to two different places in consecutive paragraphs. It is a common noun, and moreover the use in ver. 9 is defined in ver. 7 by the phrase "of Zion."—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 20. Baal-perazim = "possessor (= place, margin of Eng. A. V. plain) of breaches." Sept. ἐκ τῶν ἐπάνω διακοπῶν = מִמַּעַל, *etc.* Aq. ἔχων διακοπάς. The point of the comparison seems to be not the dividing of waters (Sept. ὡς διακόπτεται ὕδατα. Vulg., *sicut dividuntur aquæ*), but the violent rending asunder by a torrent of water —Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 21. Aq. τὰ διαποδήματα. Sym. τὰ γλυπτά, Sept. τοὺς θεούς.—Instead of "took them away," Eng. A. V. has taken the text of 1 Chr. xiv. 12 "burned them," supposing perhaps that this was the true explanation of our text. The meaning here rather is that David carried off the images, either to destroy them, or to bear them in triumph. The margin of Eng. A. V. has "took them away."—Tr.]

he said, Thou shalt not go up; *but* [*om.* but] fetch a compass behind* them, and
24 come upon them over against the mulberry-trees [baca-trees]. And let it be, when
thou hearest the sound of a going in the tops of the mulberry-trees [baca-trees],
that then thou shalt bestir thyself; for then shall [will] the Lord [Jehovah] go out
25 before thee to smite the host of the Philistines. And David did so, as the Lord
[Jehovah] had commanded him, and smote the Philistines from Geba until thou
come to Gazer [Gezer].

* [Ver. 23. Instead of אֶל־אַחֲרֵיהֶם some MSS. and EDD. and Syr., Ar. have כְּאַחֲרֵיהֶם, which does not change the sense. In a few MSS. the Prep. is omitted, as in 1 Chr. xiv. 14. The difference between the texts in Sam. and Chr. is obvious, perhaps in the latter an attempt at greater clearness; the meaning is the same in both. It is not necessary to supply anything here after "go up" (תַעֲלֶה), since the word implies "going to meet."—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

I. Vers. 6–16. *Victory over the Jebusites, conquest of the citadel of Zion, and fixing of Jerusalem as the capital.*—In keeping with the reminder of the elders that he had before led the people out and in to battle and victory, David now proceeds without delay to fulfil the warlike duties that devolved on him as king of Israel against the external enemies of the kingdom; for a principal condition of the establishment of internal unity and of the vigorous theocratic development of the national life was the purging of the land from the still powerful remains of the Canaanitish peoples.

Vers. 6–10. See the parallel 1 Chron. xi. 4–9. The two accounts agree substantially; being taken from a common source, they complement and confirm one another in particular statements, of which each has some peculiar to itself. [In respect to these differences it is important to remember that in general "Samuel" is more biographical and annalistic, "Chronicles" more historiographical. —Tr.]—Ver. 6. **And the king and his men went**—that is, according to the Chronicler, the Israelitish warriors who gathered around him from "all Israel," and were now united with his former soldiers—**to Jerusalem against the Jebusites.**—This undertaking followed immediately on the anointing in Hebron, as is evident from the statement (ver. 5) that David's reign in Jerusalem was co-extensive with his reign over all Israel (Keil). After the word "Jerusalem," instead of "unto the Jebusites ... saying," "Chronicles" has: "that is Jebus, and there (are) the Jebusites, the inhabitants of the land, and the inhabitants of Jebus said to David." Which of the two forms is nearer to the original account in the common source must remain undetermined. [Wellhausen remarks that "the original author would not have written 'Jerusalem, that is, Jebus,' but more naturally 'Jebus, that is, Jerusalem;' the Chron. inserts this statement in order to explain the transition from Jerusalem to the Jebusites—and this leads to the further remark that the Jebusites were dwelling in the land" According to this, the author of Chronicles (who wrote after the Exile) introduces this historical explanation as necessary for his time.—Tr.] The Jebusites* belonged to the great Canaanitish race (Gen. x. 6), who dwelt, when the Israelites took possession of Palestine, in the mountain-district of Judah by the Hittites and Amorites (comp. Numb. xiii. 30; Josh. xi. 3), especially at the place afterwards called Jerusalem, and under kings, Josh. x. 1, 23. Neither Joshua (Josh. xv. 8, 63; xviii. 28), who conquered the Jebusites along with other Canaanitish tribes in a battle (Josh. xi. 3 sq.), nor the children of Judah, who only got possession of the lower city (Judg. i. 8; comp. Jos. *Ant.* V. 2, 2), nor the Benjaminites, to whom the city had been assigned (Josh. xviii. 28), could conquer the strong citadel of Jebus on Mount Zion, which was the centre of their dwellings spread out "in the land," that is, around Jerusalem (Judg. i. 21; xix. 11 sq.). In the time of the Judges Jebus is still called "a strange city, in which are some of the children of Israel" (Judg. xix. 12). But as long as this point was unconquered, the possession of southern and middle Palestine was unassured; and so David's first act was the siege and capture of the citadel. Relying on its hitherto invincible strength, they declared that David could not get into it; **but the blind and the lame repel thee**—that is, if only blind and lame defend it, thou canst not take the citadel,* "saying" (=namely, the Jebusites meant to say), "David will not come in hither." Some have supposed (after Josephus) that the Jebusites had really in derision of David put *lame and blind* men on the wall, trusting to the strength of their citadel; an expression that is by no means so strange (Then.) as that which regards the blind and lame as the idol-images of the Jebusites, which they had placed on their walls for protection, and had so called in order to scoff at the Israelites, who (Psalm cxv. 4 sq. *et al.*) described heathen idols as "blind and lame" (Cler., Luth., Wasse [*de cæcis et claudis Jebusæorum*, Witt., 1721]). Would the Jebusites have used such expressions of their gods?† This saying of the Je-

* Heb. "Jebusite" (יְבֻסִי), poetically individualizing Sing. for Plu. "Inhabitant" (יוֹשֵׁב), the proper, aboriginal people. [The Sing. is not poetic, but collective; see its use in Gen. x. 16; xv 21; Numb. xiii. 29: Judg. xix. 11—the name of the tribe as an individual.—Tr.] So the verb וַיֹּאמֶר is Sing.

* כִּי אִם after a negation—"but," Ew. § 356 *a*. The הֱסִירְךָ is not Inf., but Perf., expressing a complete action. The Sing. is used because it precedes the subject (Keil, Ew. § 119 *a*). But we may with Then. point it as Plu. הֱסִירֻךָ (comp. Gen. i. 28; Isa. liii. 3, 4, where also ו has fallen out). לֵאמֹר—"namely." [On the grammatical difficulties here see "Text. and Gramm." The sense, however, is tolerably plain.—Tr.]

† [According to the Midrash (Targ. and Pirke Eleasar 36) the images of the blind Isaac and the lame Jacob are here meant, Abraham having agreed with the Jebusites (Gen. xxiii.) not to lay claim to their city. See Patr. and Philipps.—Tr.]

busites is not found in "Chronicles." [Omitted in Chron. perhaps as being obscure, or else as unnecessary to the general sense, "Chronicles" avoiding details that do not bear on its main aim, the history of the development of the theocratic cultus.—Tr.]—Ver. 7 it is briefly remarked that in spite of this braggart reliance of the Jebusites on the impregnability of their fortress, *David took it.* This old *Jebusite city and fortress* lay on the highest of the hills or mountains that surrounded Jerusalem, "Mount" Zion (2 Ki. xix. 31; Isaiah iv. 5; xxix. 8; Ps. xlviii. 3), which stretched out in the south and south-west of the city, mount Ophel and Moriah on the east (more precisely north-east) lying opposite, separated from it by a precipitous ravine. See more in Winer *s. v.* [and in the *Bible Dictionaries* and books of travel; Philippson has a good description of Jerusalem in his Comm. on this passage. It is not yet possible however to restore with precision the Jerusalem of David's time.—Tr.] The name "Zion" probably="the dry mountain" (from צָיָה "to be dry"). [See Ps. lxxviii. 17; cv. 41; Isa. xxv. 5, where the root occurs. Some take the name to mean "sunny" (Ges.), others "lofty" (Abarb. in Philippson). The rock-formation on which the city stands is limestone.—Tr.] The explanatory addition, "city of David," anticipates what is narrated in ver. 9. From this mountain, where David built (whence arose the city of David, that is, the Upper City) and resided, the city extended itself northward and eastward. [The name "City of David" was sometimes given afterwards to Jerusalem, Isa. xxix. 1; and see 1 Ki. xi. 43; xv. 8 for its use as burial-place of the kings.—Tr.]—Ver. 8. "David had said," the sense requiring the Plup. (Then.)—an appended incident of the capture in connection with the derisive words of the Jebusites. We must undoubtedly assume a reference to those words in the treatment of the following difficult and variously explained saying of David. The "blind and lame" are the Jebusites themselves, so called by David in answer to their scornful words. We must further suppose that the assailants had a difficult task before them, and were all the more embittered by the derisive remarks of the Jebusites, as David's words indicate. In the attempt to explain this obscure passage, the principal point is the meaning of the expression *ba-sinnor,* בַּצִּנּוֹר [Eng. A. V.: "to the gutter"]. *Zinnor* occurs elsewhere only Ps. xlii. 8, where the meaning assigned by several expositors (mostly with regard to our passage), "conduit, canal," does not suit at all, but the connection (in which the Psalmist speaks of the roaring of violently swelling and plunging waves) indicates the signification to be that adopted (after Sept. καταῤῥάκται) by Keil, Moll, Delitzsch, and others, "*cataract,* waterfall." Ewald accordingly translates: "Every one who conquers the Jebusites, let him cast down the *precipice* both the lame," *etc.;* and this of all the attempts at explanation is the simplest in sense and construction, suiting the locality also, since Mount Zion had steep declivities on the east, south and west, which, with the opposite-lying heights, formed deep gorges. Yet it is better with Keil to keep more strictly to the signification of the word according to Ps. xlii. 8, and to take it as meaning not with Ewald the precipitous declivity of the rock that produces the waterfall, but the *waterfall* itself. We are therefore not to think of an *aqueduct,* by cutting off which the capture of the citadel was decided (Stähelin), nor *water pipes* for carrying off the rain from the height (Vatab., Cler.), nor *gutters* (Luther), nor a subterranean passage (Joseph.). But there is nothing opposed to the supposition of a waterfall on one of the declivities. At present the south-east part of the ridge, which slopes somewhat toward the north-west (the ridge running from south to north) is still the point where appear the only springs in Jerusalem, at the foot of the declivity (comp. E. Hoffmann, *Das gelobte land,* 1871, p. 116 sq.). There is the pool of Siloah in the valley Tyropœon [cheesemongers' valley], on the border of Zion and Moriah, which receives its water from a lofty-lying basin hewn out of the rocky side of Zion,* into which it flows from springs that break forth higher up. Might not this be conjecturally the precipice spoken of in our passage, if the question of locality (a precise answer to which is impossible) is to be raised? But in another place also, for example, on the west, where is found the lower pool under the highest part of the north-western corner of Zion, there might be waterfalls which in the precipitous descent of the rocky declivity plunged into a gorge. According to this view, David gives strict orders that when the Jebusites are overcome in the fortress, where the space was relatively limited, their slain should be thrown into the waterfall. He calls them "the lame and the blind," taking up their own words, with reference, perhaps, at the same time, to the expression "every one that smiteth," *etc;* the fallen and slain in the battle (regarded as a victory) are to be cast down † the precipice, that the citadel may be free and habitable for the Israelites. The next clause may be rendered "they hate," or "who hate," pointing the verb as 3 plu. Perf.; the absence of the Rel. Pron. (Keil) is not a decisive objection to this rendering; comp. Ges. § 123, 3; Ew. § 332, 333 *b.* But the connection and warlike tone make the marginal pointing (Pass. Partcp.) also appropriate: "who are hated of David's soul," that is, hated by David in his "soul." Both of these admissible renderings point to the fact that the Israelites had to maintain a furious, embittered combat with this enemy who so confidently and scornfully boasted of his strong fortress, and they were directed to make short work of it with the "blind and lame" in the assault, and clear the ground of the enemy straightway. **Therefore they say: Blind and lame will not come into the house.**—That is, one holds no intercourse with disagreeable, hateful people like the Jebusites; or, with reference to the crippled condition of lame and blind persons, the sense is: "will not get home," like those blind and lame plunged into the precipice and unable to get back.‡ "Into the house." Some (Buns., Then.) understand by this *the temple,* and assume (with reference to Acts iii. 2; John ix. 1; viii. 59) an old law, forbidding the blind and the lame to enter the temple, which law

* [Instead of "Zion" we should here read "Moriah." See Art. *Siloam* in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*—Tr.]

† The verb is to be pointed as Hiph. יַשְׁלֵךְ "cast down."

‡ [Or because they are poor defenders (Philippson).—Tr.]

the narrator derives from this incident; but this view is wholly without support. This explanation [Erdmann's explanation of the whole passage] avoids the difficulty that ensues when David's address is taken as protasis merely, and the apodosis supplied [as in Eng. A. V., Philippson]. Against Thenius' rendering: "he who smites the Jebusites (paves the way to the capture of the city, in that he first) reaches the *battlements* and the lame and the blind—him David's soul *envies*" apart from its unwarranted changes of text*—it is rightly remarked by Böttcher that its tone is too modern: one cannot well think of David as showing envy at such a military exploit (unfortunately not open to him), in order to inflame the ardor of his warriors. Bottcher translates: "he who smites the Jebusites shall attain the *staff*," that is, become *captain;* against which it is to be remarked with Thenius that he has not succeeded in showing (*Zeitschr. d. morgenl. Gesellschaft*, 1857, p. 541 sq.) that *sinnor* means "captain's staff," and that, according to the *unrestricting* phrase "*every one* that smites," David would have had a good many staffs of the sort to bestow; and for the same reason the remark of the Chronicler (1 Chr. xi. 6, which omits our ver. 8) that "David announced that whoever first smote the Jebusites should be chief and captain, and Joab won this prize," is not to be taken as an exhibition of the sense of our passage (against Böttcher). Maurer changes the text† and translates: "He who has smitten the Jebusites and reached the canal, let him slay those blind and lame," to which the objection is the tautology in protasis and apodosis. Maurer's other rendering:‡ "whoever shall slay the Jebusites and reach with the sword either the lame or the blind, him will David's soul hate" [that is, as Maurer explains, David forbids his men to slay the Jebusites with the sword, in order that these boasters might die a shameful death.—Tr.], contains, as Thenius rightly remarks, a *contradictio in adjecto*, "and David would, according to this, have desired something impossible." Joab, having led the stormers in the attack, was named by David "*head and prince*," that is, elevated to the rank of *general-in-chief* of the whole army of Israel, which, according to ii. 13, he could not yet have been. [The decisive objection to Erdmann's rendering: "let him *cast into* the waterfall the blind," *etc.*, is that the verb (נגע) whether in Qal or in Hiphil, cannot be so translated. In Qal it means only "to reach, touch, strike," the object reached being usually introduced by בְּ; in Hiph. it means "to cause to touch, to join, to raze," usually followed by אֶל, עַל, עַד or לְ. In the passages most favorable to Erdmann's rendering, such as Ezek. xiii. 14; Isaiah xxvi. 5, the object introduced by the Prep. is that *to which* something is brought (corresponding to the signification "touch" of the verb), not that *into which* it is cast. Similarly, for reasons derived from the construction of the verb, we must reject the interpretation of *Bib. Com.:* "whosoever will smite the Jebusites, let him reach both the lame and the blind, who are the hated of David's soul, by the water-course, *and he shall be chief*," which, moreover, hardly renders the וְ in the first וְאֵת (it must here = "and," though it might as an emendation of text be omitted). The natural conception of the passage would lead us to take *sinnor* as the object reached (so Eng. A. V., Philippson, Cahen), but it is very difficult in that case to find a satisfactory meaning for this word, or to construe the following words. Wellhausen would take it to mean some part of the body, a blow on which or violent grasping of which produces death, and Hitzig suggested the ear, others the throat (*sinnor* being supposed to mean a "tube"); but the absolute form of the word ("let him seize the throat") is opposed to this rendering, and the construction of the following words presents a difficulty, even if we suppose the אֵת to be used as equivalent to בְּ. Taking *sinnor* (as seems safest) to mean "channel, canal," the whole context and tone suggests that "the blind and the lame" is the object of the verb "smite," or some similar verb, and it is not unlikely that the inversion of the Eng. A. V. (though an impossible translation of the present text) gives the general sense. The supplying of an apodosis is harsh, but we have here only a choice of difficulties. No defensible translation of the passage has yet been proposed, and it is natural to conjecture that the text is corrupt, though its restoration is now perhaps impossible.—Tr.]

Ver. 9. *Two* things are here said: 1) David took up his *abode* in the conquered *Jebusite citadel*, which with its buildings formed the *Upper City*, and called it the *City of David.* Chron.: "therefore it is called the city of David." He made it the royal residence (which was equivalent to making Jerusalem the capital), on account of its remarkable strength, through which alone the Jebusites had been able to hold it so long, and on account of its very favorable position on the border between Judah and Benjamin, almost in the centre of the land. 2) *The building up of this city.* **And David built round about from the Millo and inward.**—The Def. Art. before "Millo" shows that this work was already in existence at the time of the capture, having been founded by the Jebusites. From the connection the *Millo* must have belonged to the citadel on Zion and have formed a part of the fortification. This alone would set aside the explanation of the word (founded on the etymology = "a filling out") as = "outfilling embankment," an *earthwall*, which ran aslant through the Wady and connected Mount Zion with the opposite-lying temple-mountain (Kraft's *Topog.*, p. 94, Schultz, *Jerus.* 80, Ewald and others)—apart from the fact that that connection is shown by the latest investigations to have been not an earthwall, but a bridge resting on arches (Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung*, p. 223 sq.). But a comparison of Judg. ix. 6, 20, 46-49, puts it beyond doubt that Millo is the castle proper of the citadel or fortification = Bastion, a strong fortified tower or separate fortification which is called "house" in Judg. ix. 6,

* He changes בַּצִּנּוֹר into בְּפִנּוֹת, and שְׂנֻאֵו into קִנְאוֹ — "envies him."

† He reads יַכֶּה instead of וְאֵת.

‡ Following Sept. ἐν παραξιφίδι (Hesych. = ἐν μαχαίρᾳ) he reads בַּצּוּר for בַּצִּנּוֹר, referring to Psalm lxxxix. 44 צוּר חֶרֶב.

20; 2 Kings xii. 21. The fort designed to protect the citadel and Upper City on Zion, lay no doubt at the point most exposed to hostile attack, that is, the northwest end of Zion, where the castle still stands. "*From the Millo out*" David built "around and inward," that is, while Millo formed the most advanced fortification, he built in connection with it and out from it on Zion, 1) "*round-about*" the city and citadel for further fortification, as was necessary especially on the north towards the Lower City, where an attack could be most easily made, and 2) "*inward*," so that the Upper City (City of David or of Zion) was extended by houses and defensive edifices, and more and more covered the mountain. The Chronicler (1 Chr. xi. 8) expresses substantially the same thing: "from one surrounding to the other," that is, the whole space between the fortifications which were built around. As it is here clearly only buildings designed to fortify and extend the city *on Zion* that are spoken of, Josephus has misunderstood this passage when he relates (*Ant.* 7, 3, 2) that David surrounded the *Lower* City and the citadel with a wall, and united them into one. Comp. Winer, *s. v.* and Arnold in Herzog, *s. v.* "Zion" (XVIII. 623 sq.). On the extension of the Millo and the other fortifications by Solomon see 1 Kings ix. 15, 24; xi. 27. [See also 2 Chr. xxxii. 5.—Bib. Com. refers to Lewin's "Siege of Jerusalem." p. 256 sq., where it is argued from the etymology and the mentions in the Bible that the great platform, called the Haram esh-Sherif (1500 by 900 feet) was itself Millo, and Mr. Lewin thinks that Solomon's Palace (Beth-Millo, so called from abutting on Millo) was built on a terrace immediately *below*, and to the south of the Temple-area.—Patrick: "Some take Millo to be the low place between the fort and the city, which was now 'filled' with people."—On the "Palace of Solomon" see "Recovery of Jerusalem" (Am. Ed.) pp. 84, 91, 222, 249, and see also the remarks on the Haram esh-Sherif.—Tr.]. According to 1 Chr. xi. 9, "Joab renewed the rest of the city," that is, he restored at David's command what was destroyed in the capture. He thus seems as "chief and captain" to have been charged also with other than military affairs.—Ver. 10. General statement of the *continuous advance and growth of David in power and consideration.* Observe, 1) how this is referred to the highest source, not merely to God's assistance, but to the fact that *God was with him*, and 2) how God is in this connection called the *God of Hosts.*

Vers. 11-16. *David's house.* Building of a royal *residence*, and extension of his *family.* Comp. 1 Chr. xiv. 1-7.—**And Hiram, king of Tyre, sent messengers unto David.**—This name is written variously, Heb. Hiram or Huram (חוּרָם 2 Chr. ii. 2), Phœnician Hirom (1 Kings v. 24, 32), Sept. Χειράμ (Cheiram), Joseph., Eiram and Eirom. That this king Hiram, who was in friendly connection with David, is the same Hiram that was Solomon's friend and ally, and his helper in building the Temple and palace, is clear not only from 2 Chron. ii. 2: "as thou hast done to David my father, (so do to me also"), but also from 1 Kings v. 15: "Hiram had always been David's friend." We can neither suppose therefore, with Ewald, that this king Hiram is the grandfather of Solomon's friend of the same name, nor with Thenius that his (our Hiram's) father is here meant, whose name according to Menander of Ephesus (in Joseph. *cont. Ap.* I. 18) was *Abibaal*, whether this be considered a surname to the proper name Hiram, or it be held that the two persons are here confounded. The occasion to this hypothesis has been given by the difference that exists between the Biblical chronological statements and those of Josephus after Menander. The latter relates (Jos. *ubi sup.*) that Hiram succeeded his father Abibaal, and that he died in the thirty-fourth year of his reign and the fifty-third of his life. With this is to be connected the statement of Josephus (*ubi sup.* and Ant. 8, 3, 1) that Solomon began the temple in the twelfth year of Hiram. Now, according to 1 Kings ix. 10 sq., Hiram was still living after twenty years of Solomon's reign, counting from the beginning of the Temple-building (and therefore twenty-four years of his reign in all) had elapsed, namely seven years for the building of the Temple (1 Kings vi. 38, and thirteen years for the building of the palace (vii. 1). On comparing these statements of the Bible and Josephus, it appears that Hiram reigned at the most eight years contemporaneously with David, and that therefore David *began* his palace in about the seventh year before his death, that is, in the sixty-third year of his life, and that his determination to build a temple to the Lord (which was after the completion of his palace, 2 Sam. vii. 2) was not made till the last years of his life. Both these conclusions, however, are incompatible with our passage and with ch. vii.; for the position of these two narratives in the connection of the history leaves no doubt that both things belonged to David's prime of manhood. It has indeed been declared, in order to set aside the discrepancy, that the Books of Samuel narrate events not so much in chronological order as in the connection of things, and that here the building of the palace. which occurred much later, is related in connection with other buildings (Movers, *Phönix.* II. 1, 147 sq., Rütschi in Herzog. *s. v.* Hiram, Stähelin, *spez. Einl.* 107). And in fact it must be admitted that David's palace-building, which must have taken time, and supposes a corresponding period of rest and peace, probably did not (as might appear from the narrative) follow immediately on the conquest of Zion, *before* the Philistine war (ver. 17) which broke out as soon as the Philistines heard of David's anointment as king over Israel, but after this war. "The historian has rather attached to the conquest of Zion and its choice as David's residence not only what David gradually did to strengthen and beautify the new capital, but also the account of his wives and the children that were born to him in Jerusalem" (Keil). But though in detached instances a topical rather than a chronological arrangement of the material is to be recognized, it is nevertheless not probable in itself that David would have deferred the building of a royal palace till the last part of his life; and further, this, as Winer rightly observes, would not accord with ch. xi. 2, where the palace whence David sees Bathsheba is called the "*king's palace*," which is to be understood, not of the simple house that David took as his dwelling-place on Mount Zion immediately after its capture, but of the

place that he had had built for himself there. Comp. vii. 1, 2. And if the affair with Bathsheba occurred when David was an old man, which is in itself highly improbable, Solomon, who was born a couple of years later, would have been a little child when he ascended the throne. If David had not resolved on the building of the Temple till in advanced life, or towards the close of his life, we could not harmonize this fact with 1 Sam. vii. 12, and 1 Chr. xxii. 9, according to which Solomon was not yet born when David received the divine promise there mentioned. If therefore the account of the palace-building is in *this* place chronologically anticipatory, the building is nevertheless not to be put towards the end of David's reign. We are therefore forced to assume a longer reign for king Hiram, and to suppose inaccuracies in the chronological statements of Josephus, as has been shown to be true in the periods of reign of the succeeding Tyrian kings, even when he refers to Menander. See more in Movers (*ubi supra*) and Keil on this verse.—[On Tyre see Movers and Arts. in *Bib. Dict.*—Tr.]

It is not said that the object of this embassy, as in Solomon's case (1 Kings ix. 15), was to congratulate David on his accession to the throne (Then.), and this is improbable from the length of time (presupposed in his purpose to build) that must have elapsed since his accession. We should rather infer from the sending of cedar wood and workmen along with the messengers, that *David* had previously put himself in connection with Hiram, partly to maintain a good understanding with a powerful neighbor, partly and especially to obtain the help of this king (who was renowned for his magnificent edifices, *Mov.* II. 1, 190 sq.) in his building plans.—The eastern part of Lebanon (Antilibanus), which belonged to Israel, produced only firs, pines and cypresses (*Rob. Pal.* III. 723)*; the northwestern part, which alone was covered with cedar-forests, and furnished the best cedar for building, belonged to Phœnicia. On account of its strength, durability, beauty and fragrance, the cedar-wood was much used for costly building and wainscoting.—Through Tyrian workmen David began the splendid structures of cedar in Jerusalem, which had so increased in Jeremiah's time that he could exclaim to the city: "Thou dwellest on Lebanon and makest thy nest in the cedars" [Jer. xxii. 23].

Ver. 12. **And David perceived**, namely, from his success externally against Israel's enemies and in the connection with the friendly king of Tyre, and internally in the establishment of unity in Israel and in the execution of his plans, **that the Lord had established him king over Israel**; the "*established*" (in contrast with the previous divine choice of David as king and the fate of Saul's kingdom) refers to the *divine providences*, through which, as David clearly saw, all doubt as to the permanence of his kingdom was ended, and it immovably established. **And that he had exalted his kingdom** (*Chron*: "and that his kingdom was exalted on high" [I. xiv. 2]) **for his people Israel's sake**, that is, not for the sake of the *blessing* that rested on his people Israel (Bunsen), nor simply because he had *chosen* them (Then.), but because he wished to rule them as *his* (chosen) people through David's kingdom, glorify himself in them and make them a great and mighty people according to his covenant-faithfulness.

Vers. 13–16. *Account of the growth of David's house and family*, appended to the summary statement concerning the establishment of his kingdom and his palace-building. **Concubines and wives.**—David follows the custom of eastern princes, and gathers a numerous harem. See the law against this, Deut. xvii. 17. The "concubines" are mentioned first in order to bring out prominently the extension of the harem, as an essential part of oriental court-state, and as a symbol of royal power. The omission of the "concubines" in 1 Chr. xiv. 3 is not to be regarded as intentional (against Then.), for David's concubines are mentioned in 1 Chr. iii. 9.—"From Jerusalem" (מִן) is not = "elsewhere than in Jerusalem," which view (Keil) cannot be based on the following words, "after he came from Hebron," but (because of this very chronological statement) = "from, that is, *out of* Jerusalem," substantially agreeing with Chron.: "in Jerusalem." After changing his residence from Hebron to Jerusalem, David took concubines and wives in the latter place also.—The statement: **sons and daughters were born to him** shows clearly that, in all these summary accounts concerning family and *building*, a greater space of time than at the beginning of his reign is assumed; and this statement is here put proleptically not only before the following notice of the Philistine wars, but also before the narrative concerning Bathsheba. For among the sons of David (given in 1 Chr. xiv. 5-7, and also in iii. 5-8) occur here first the names of the four sons of *Bathsheba:* Shammua, Shobab, Nathan and Solomon. For *Shammua* Chron. (I. iii. 5) has *Shimea*, and for *Elishua* it has (ver. 6) *Elishama*, a clerical error from the following *Elishama*. After *Elishua*, 1 Chr. iii. 6, and xiv. 6 sq. have the two names *Eliphalet* (or *Elpalet*) and *Nogah*. This last is not to be taken as miswriting of *Nepheg* (Mov.). Thenius supposes that the latter (Nogah) has fallen out of our text by oversight, and that the former (Eliphalet) got into the text of Chron. by mistake from the following verse (ver. 16), that David had, therefore, only *eight* sons, not *nine* (as in 1 Chr. iii. 8) born in Jerusalem.—Keil thinks that the names of these two sons are omitted in our passage because they died early, and the late-born Eliphalet (whose name stands last) received the name of his dead brother; but the question is involved in doubt. According to the former view David had *in all* eighteen sons, according to the latter nineteen, of whom six were born in Hebron (2 Sam. iii. 2 sq.). Instead of *Eliada* 1 Chron. xiv. 7 has Beeliada, another form of the name, with *Baal* [= lord] instead of *El* [= God]. No daughter is named (see ver. 13), because daughters are in general not considered in genealogical lists. The only daughter that appears by name in the following history is Tamar, chap. xiii. 1. [Patrick: Kimchi says that Sam. gives the sons of the wives only, Chron., those of wives and con-

* [See Am. Ed. of Rob. III. 441, 485, 489, 491, 547, 548 and 420; also II. 437, 438, and for the cedars II. 493, III. 588-593; see also Articles in the Bible Dictionaries and later books of travel, as Thomson's *Land and Book*, I. p. 292-297.—Tr.]

cubines, which does not agree with 1 Chron. iii. 9.—It was looked on as a piece of political wisdom in princes to endeavor to have many children, that by matching them into many potent families they might strengthen their interest and authority.–Tr.]

II. Vers. 17–25. *David's victories over the Philistines*, 1 Chr. xiv. 8–17.—Ver. 17. **And when the Philistines heard that they had anointed David king over Israel**—this was the occasion of the war. From David's elevation to the throne of all Israel and the consequent unification of the people, the Philistines feared (and did their best to prevent) such increase in his power as would endanger their power and foothold not only in Palestine [Israel], but also in their own land. Hence, according to the narrative, their attack followed on the *receipt of intelligence of his anointment*, which must have come on them as a surprise. Ewald conjectures (but it is a mere conjecture, and unnecessary) that the occasion of the war was David's withholding the tribute that he had paid the Philistines while he was in Hebron.—**And all the Philistines marched up**, namely, from the lowlands of Judah which they held, or from their own land against the Israelitish army (with which David had attacked the Jebusites) which was on the *mountain*-plateau of Judah. As this Jebusite war followed immediately on David's anointment (comp. vers. 3, 6), and the gathering of *all* the Philistines was not the affair of a moment, it is for this reason alone an untenable view that these two victories "probably belonged in the interval between the second anointment at Hebron and the capture of Zion" (Keil). But the following words: **And when David heard of it, he marched down to the hold**, are decisive, for the reference (as the context shows) is here to Mount Zion, which is mentioned just before (vers. 7, 9); and this is proved also by the Def. Art., which (from the context) cannot refer to some other stronghold in Judah resorted to by David in Saul's time (so Keil, who cites xxiii. 14), but points to the citadel of Zion which is here twice named with emphasis as the centre of David's position. The expression "he *went down* to the hold" is not against this view; for, though the citadel of Zion was so high that one ascended to it from all sides, yet its plateau was by no means a horizontal plain, but was made up of higher and lower parts, and David of course made his residence on the highest and safest part, the most favorable position for a military outlook, while the fortifications most protective against the enemy (enlarged by him, ver. 9) must certainly have lain on the relatively lower *north-western* side (in accordance with their design), and with this agrees the fact that the Philistines advanced to the attack from the *west*. David, accordingly, on hearing of the approach of the Philistines, went *down* from his residence to the fortifications on Zion, in order to make at this rendezvous and sally-point of his army the necessary preparations whether for defence (Maur.) or for attack. Maurer: "David was not yet certain whether to defend himself at the walls, or to advance to meet the enemy," comp. ver. 19. There is no need, therefore, to change the text* (Syr., Mich., Dathe) to "siege" (besiegers), the narrative giving no hint of a siege. It is by no means sure (Then.) from xxiii. 13, 14, that the hold here referred to is the cave of Adullam; for, even if the incident here related was an episode in this Philistine war, it may very well have occurred after David had left the citadel to march against the Philistines, while they were encamped in the valley of Rephaim. [Still, the impression made on us is that David went down into the plain against the Philistines; thus in ver. 20 he does not *go down*, but *comes* to Baal-perazim, as if he were already in the plain. Perhaps the editor has here inserted a separate narrative of this war, so that the "hold" here may be different from the "hold" in ver. 9. Adullam was a strong place, and was fortified by Rehoboam (2 Chron. xi. 7). If we take the narrative in xxiii. 13–17 to belong to the time of this war, it would show that David was at one time hard pressed; but this cannot be determined with certainty.—Tr.]—The phrase: "*to seek* David," cannot prove that David had at this time not yet taken up his residence on Zion (Keil), but only that the aim of the Philistines was to get possession of the *person* of David so dangerous to them.—Ver. 18. The *strategical position* of the Philistines. Instead of our text-word "spread themselves," 1 Chron. xiv. 9 has "made an inroad" (פשט). *The valley of Rephaim*, according to Josh. xv. 8, was a fruitful plain,* nearly three miles long by two wide, separated from the valley of Ben-hinnom (south and southwest of Jerusalem) by a ridge, and large enough to hold a large army in camp; it was named after the old Canaanitish giant-tribe, the Rephaim (Gen. xiv. 5). Comp. Rob. I. 365 [Am. Ed. I. 219, 469], Tobl., *Top. Jerus.* II. 401 sq., and 3 *Wand.* 202, Winer II. 322, Thenius in Käuffer's *Stud.* II. 137 sq. [For various opinions see Kitto, Porter, Bonar, Fürst.—Tr.] The Philistines had probably advanced from the west by way of Bethshemesh (comp. 1 Sam. vi. 9).

Ver. 19. David *inquires of the Lord* (comp. ii. 1; 1 Sam. xxiii. 2), 1) whether he shall march out against the Philistines, and 2) whether he shall get the victory over them. The expression "*shall I go up?*" is explained by the fact that David has led his army down from Mount Zion, the defence of which he had first to keep in view. He now advances to the *attack* from his position in the plain, which lay lower than the Philistines, *perhaps* near the cave of Adullam (Then.), after having inquired of the Lord and received an affirmative answer. He no doubt made a sudden impetuous attack, as is clear from the meaning of the name "*Baal-perazim*," the place where he "smote" the Philistines. He said, namely (referring the victory to the Lord according to the Lord's answer, ver. 19): "The Lord hath *broken asunder* (or *through*) my enemies before me as the breach of waters," that is, as a violent torrent makes a *rift* or *breach*. All other explanations, that make the point of comparison the division of the water-mass itself, depart from the conception of the expression, and weaken the force of the image. The place where

* מְצֻרָה instead of מְצוּדָה.

* עֵמֶק, comp. Isa. xvii. 5. [See Stanley's "*Sinai and Pal.*," App. § 1.—Tr.]

the battle was fought was thus called, from the way that David won it, *Water-breach*, "*Bruchhausen, Brechendorf*" (Keil) [Breach-ham, Breakthorpe—the Heb. name = "possessor of breaches."*—Tr.]. It cannot have been far from the Valley of Rephaim. In Isa. xxviii. 21 it is called (with allusion to this battle) "mount" Perazim. This fills out the topographical description of the place, and in exact accordance with the name "water-breach." As a torrent plunging from the *mountain* rends asunder everything before it, so David rushed with his army suddenly and unexpectedly on the Philistines, from a gorge opening into the valley of Rephaim, burst through and scattered them with impetuous and irresistible power. Perhaps he marched northward around the position of the Philistines, and attacked them from the rocky height (the border of the valley of Hinnom), that bounds the valley of Rephaim on the north, comp. Josh. xv. 8.—Ver. 21. **And there they left their images behind**, which they were doubtless accustomed to carry with them to war, in order to make the victory more certain.† Clericus: "as if they would feel the help of the gods more present, if they had their statues along. Perhaps they imitated the Hebrews, who sometimes carried the ark of God into camp." Their abandonment of their sacred images confirms the supposition (founded on the name of the scene of battle) that David made a sudden attack. Chron. has (by way of explanation) "gods" instead of "images." According to our passage *David took them away* as spoil; according to Chron., they were at David's command *burned with fire*. It cannot be determined whether this text of Chron. is an addition from another source (Movers), or taken from the same source as our text (Keil), or an explanatory remark of the Chronicler himself according to Deut. vii. 5, 25, where the burning of heathen idols is prescribed. Thus the disgrace of the Philistine capture of the Ark was wiped out.

Vers. 22–25. Second invasion by the Philistines and victory over them.—Ver. 22. Their approach is described (as ver. 17) by the phrase: *came up*. They had therefore fled as far as the lowland on the west, but, as David had not pursued them, soon assembled again. They advance (as ver. 18) to the *valley of Rephaim*. Chron. (ver. 13) has simply: "in the valley," Rephaim being understood from the context, and in fact supplied by Sept., Syr. and Arab. [Joseph., *Ant.* 7, 4, 1: "let no one suppose that the Philistines brought a small force against the Hebrews; all Syria and Phœnicia and many other warlike nations fought with them; only thus could they march against the Hebrews after their frequent defeats." But this assertion is unsupported and not necessary to explain the recuperation of the powerful Philistines. Josephus was anxious to magnify the prowess of his own nation.—Tr.]—Ver. 23. David again inquires of the Lord [Jos.: through the high-priest]. The words: "thou shalt not go up," suppose the question (as in ver. 19): *shall I go up?* The negative answer: "*go not up*" refers to the height, up to which David had gone in the first battle, in order thence to fall on the Philistines; for this time they had doubtless guarded against a surprise on that side. If their front was now in that direction, the addition of the Sept.: "to meet them," and Vulg.: "against them (= in front)," may be regarded as a correct explanation; but there is no necessity, as Then. supposes, for supplementing the Heb. text with this expression (לִקְרָאתָם).—**Make a detour to their rear.**—Chron.: "go not up behind them,* but turn from them, and come on them." David was to fall on their rear *opposite the "baca-trees."* These (mentioned only here and 1 Chron. xiv. 14) are not pear-trees (Sept., Vulg., Aq., Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Pflanzenreich*, p. 249) or mulberry-trees (Jewish expositors, Luth. [Eng. A. V.]), but shrub-like baca-trees, which grow especially about Mecca (called *Baca* by the Arabs), similar to the balsam-shrub, from which they differ only in having longer leaves and larger round fruit (according to Abulfadli in *Cels. Hierob.* I. 338 sq.; comp. Niebuhr, *Beschreibung*, 339, Faber in Harmer's *Beobacht. über d. Orient*, I. 400, and Burckhardt *Reise in Syrien, etc.*, 977, who found a baca-valley near Sinai). See Winer I. *s. v.* The name is probably derived from a verb meaning "to weep" (בָּכָה = בָּכָא), because when the leaves are broken or cut off, a tear-like sap exudes. Comp. the "valley of Baca" = "valley of weeping, tear-dale" [Ps. lxxxiv. 6].—[For further opinions and details see Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, Art. Mulberry-tree.—Tr.]—The connection and the local presuppositions of the narrative put it beyond doubt that these baca-trees stood somewhere in the valley of Rephaim.—Ver. 24.† **And when thou hearest the sound of a going.**‡ . . . The sound produced by human steps (1 Kings xiv. 6; 2 Kings vi. 32), here the sound of an advancing army, is (as in Gen. iii. 8) employed as the symbol of the approach of the Lord—**in the tops of the baca-trees**, they, namely, being moved by a strong wind [Jos.: "while no wind was blowing."—Tr.]; the sound thus produced would indicate the advance of the Lord with His invisible hosts; it was to be the sign that He Himself would march before the army of Israel with His victorious might, comp. 1 Kings xix. 11 sq. So Jacob (Gen. xxxii. 2, 3) and Elisha (2 Kings vi. 17) behold in vision the guardian hosts of God. **Then be sharp**, that is, rush quickly to the attack [bestir thyself]! Chron. weaker and probably not original: "go out to battle." The *ground:* **For then will the Lord go out before thee**, *etc.*, he should know by the above sign that the time appointed by the Lord for a sharp attack and for the revelation of His helping power was come. [The sound of going in the trees seems here represented by the narrative as supernatural, not produced by wind.—Instead of "in the tops," *etc.*, Patrick renders: "in the beginnings," *etc.* (Neh. iii. 10), that is, at the

---

* [Or, possibly "lord (= God) of breaches." Comp. Gen. xxii. 14 and xvi. 13 (El-roi).—Tr.]

† [So the Edomites, 2 Chron. xxv. 14. The heathen idols were carried off with impunity—not so the Ark of God (Pat.).—Tr.]

* ["After them" = "to meet them."—Tr.]

† וַיְהִי for וְהָיָה, Ew., § 345 *b*.

‡ [The word signifies a majestic, stately tread or stepping, often used of God. Ps. lxviii. 7.—Tr.]

entrance of the place where the trees stood, "for men do not walk on the tops of trees, and God intended to make a sound as if a vast number of men were marching." There is no need, however, of this difficult translation, if the sound be taken as a supernatural sign.—Tr.]—Ver. 25. Exact carrying out of the divine directions, and bestowal of the promised divine aid.—**David smote the Philistines from Geba as far as the region of Gezer.**—The direction of the battle and flight is determined by the position of Gezer to be from south-east *to north-west*, whatever the position of Geba be held to be. *Geser* or *Gaser* (1 Chron. xiv. 16), Gazer and Gazera (Sept.), afterwards Gazara (2 Mac. x. 32; Jos. *Ant.* 8, 6, 1) or Gadara (Joseph. *Ant.* 5, 1, 22; 12, 7, 14) and Gadaris (Strabo XVI. 759)—an old Canaanitish royal city (Josh. xii. 12), belonging to the tribe of Ephraim, who did not drive the Canaanites out of it (Josh. xvi. 9, 10; Judg. i. 29), in the south of Ephraim (whose border passed from Lower Beth-horon over Gezer to the sea north of Joppa), north-west of Beth-horon on the western declivity of Mount Ephraim, where the latter sank into the Philistine plain (Plain of Sharon). Solomon fortified it, along with other important military positions (1 Kings ix. 15–17), inasmuch as it formed a strong defence towards the south against the Philistines; for "from this point an army might penetrate into the country and reach the capital far more easily than over the mountains of Judah" (see Then. and Bähr *in loco*). It is noteworthy that this place plays an important part as fortress in the Maccabean time also, and that the route taken by Judas Maccabæus from Emmaus to Gazer (1 Mac. iv. 15) and from Adasa to Gazer (1 Mac. vii. 45) is the same as this, namely, the north-westerly. Comp. v. Raumer, p. 191, and his map. For the *Geba*, from which David pursued the Philistines, is not = Gibeon (according to the inexact reading of Chron., which constantly changes the Gibeah of First Samuel into Gibeon, Stähelin, *Leben Davids* 38), which is adopted by Movers, Then., Keil, Dächsel—nor = Gibeah, whether Gibeah in Judah (Josh. xv. 57), 8–10 miles south-west of Jerusalem (Bertheau, Stähelin), or Gibeah of Samuel (Cler., Budd., O. v. Gerlach), neither of which could here come into consideration as a military position—but it is the place known from 1 Sam. xiii. 15–23 as the camping-ground of Saul and Jonathan, on the southern border of the Wady-es-Suweinit, opposite Michmash (now Mukhmas) which is on the northern border of the Wady, where Rob. found a place Jeba (with ruins) still existing. Comp. Isa. x. 29. See Rob., *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1844, p. 598, and v. Raumer, 196, Furrer, *Wanderungen*, 212–217, Fay [in Lange's *Biblework*] on Josh. xviii. 24. The battle therefore passed from the valley of Rephaim on the west of Jerusalem about nine miles northward to the plateau of Geba, where the Philistines vainly tried to make a stand, and, having the deep gorge of Michmash before them, took a north-westerly direction towards Beth-horon and Gezer. Here the pursuit ceased, because the Philistines were driven into the plain, and no danger could be apprehended from them. According to Joseph. (*Ant.* 7, 4. 1) Gazer was then their extreme northern limit. On the great extension of their power northward comp. Stark, *Gaza*, 170.—[Gibeon (instead of Geba) is here preferred by many critics, because Gibeon lies more nearly on the road from Rephaim to Gezer; but the pursuit may easily have gone first north to Geba and then west to Gezer, as Erdmann points out. It is not to be expected, however, that we can settle with absolute certainty these minute geographical points.—The phrase: "till thou come to Gezer," does not necessarily mean: "up to Gezer," but, like the similar expression: "as thou goest," may = "on the way to." See on 1 Sam. xxvii. 8.—Tr.]

In reference to the chronological relation of the account here, vers. 17–25, and that in 1 Chr. xiv. 8–17 it is to be remarked that the two differ, in that the former puts these victories without further statement in the beginning of David's government over all Israel, the latter in the interval between the unsuccessful and the successful attempts to remove the Ark. "Whether this exacter statement of time is correct cannot be determined with certainty" (Stähelin, *ubi sup.*, p. 37).

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. In his first royal deed of arms David, by a victory over the last Canaanites of any power that were left, completed the conquest of the land for the Lord's covenant-people, and thus concluded the military work that was first entrusted by divine command to Joshua (Josh. i. 1–9), but had been completed neither by him, nor by the Judges, nor by Saul. The result of this first exploit against the Jebusites was the firm establishment of the royal rule in the strongest position and in the centre of the land.

2. In David's person and government the Covenant-God, the King of His people, takes His royal seat on *Mount Zion*, and the *city* that David builds there is (with old Jerusalem under Zion) called, as being the theocratic dwelling-place and holy city of God, the "city of the great King" (Matt. v. 35). In the historical books the "*City of David*" (ver. 9) always has the narrower signification of the old Upper City or David's city, being used only in poetry of the whole city (Isa. xxii. 9; comp. xxxi. 1) while according to 1 Kings viii. 2: 2 Chronicles vi. 2; 1 Chronicles xv. 1, 29; it is distinctly differenced from Jerusalem as a whole. So "*Zion*" in the historical books means originally only Mount Zion, on which the city of David lay, but is used by Poets and Prophets for Jerusalem in general, in allusion to its character as God's royal dwelling-place and throne (see Arnold, "Zion" in *Herzog* XVIII., Hupfeld in *Zeitschr. d. deutsch. morgenl. ges.* XV., p. 224, Rem. 67). From the time of David's making his residence on Mount Zion dates in the theocratic language of the Old Covenant the terminology of God's royal dwelling and enthronement in the midst of His people on His regnal seat, "Mount Zion." See Ps. iii. 5 [4]: "He hears me from His holy mountain." Ps. ix. 12 [11]: "Sing ye to the Lord, who is enthroned on Zion." Ps. xv. 1; xxiv. 3; Isa. viii. 18; Joel iv. 16, 21, and other passages. "Zion" is the royal seat of the future Anointed of the Lord, of whom David

with his theocratical kingdom is the *type*, and concerning whom the promise in ch. vii. comes to him, the fulfillment of which is the matter of the prophetic declaration in Ps. ii., lxxxix., cx. Mount Zion is the geographical-historical symbol of the dominion of the Messiah to be sent by God to His people, and of the extension of the Messianic kingdom of God from this as centre. Hengstenberg on Ps. ii. 6: "Zion, the holy *mountain* of the Lord, is the fitting seat for His *king;* for as after David's time it was the centre of Israel, so is it destined to become some day the centre of the world, for from Zion goes forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem" (Isa. ii. 3).

3. The *military stamp* of the first part of David's reign is the pre-indication of the military character of the whole of it. That the theocracy in Israel may be developed, he purges the land of the remains of the heathen, extends the borders of Israel, and secures for the people the possession of the land and the maintenance of their boundaries by mighty victories over all their enemies. In the Psalms of David we hear the echo of this warlike and victorious theocracy. They are mostly songs of conflict and victory in praise of the God who saved His people from their enemies. Ps. ix. may serve as an example of them all, much of it corresponding with David's experiences in these first wars and victories, though it cannot be said that it was composed with special reference thereto.

4. Several prominent features *characteristic of the prophetical-theocratical historiography* appear in this section (which embraces the elevation of David to the throne of Israel, his wars against internal and external enemies): 1) the relation between king and people is described as essentially a covenant before the Lord (ver. 3); 2) it is declared to be the task and calling of the theocratic king to be shepherd and captain of the people (ver. 2); 3) the reference of all the king's successes to the highest and last source, the God of Sabaoth, who was with him, whereby all his own human merit is excluded (ver. 10); 4) the conception of all these events whereby David's kingdom was confirmed and recognized even by the powerful heathen king of Tyre, through whose friendly relations with David it was exalted and honored at home and abroad, as ordinations of God, the object of which was to establish David's kingdom as a divine institution, and give him the assurance that he was confirmed by the Lord immediately as king over Israel (ver. 12); 5) the repeated exhibition of David's humble subjection of his *will* to the will of God, which he seeks and asks after, that he may have a sure path in what he is to do, which path the divine answer shows him (vers. 19, 23); and 6) the express declaration of David's unconditional *active* obedience to the Lord's will, which is revealed to him in a definite Yes and No (ver. 25).

5. All the powers and goods of the world which have their *origin* in the *might* and *goodness* of God, are employed by Him also for the *ends* of His *wisdom* in the government of His kingdom of grace (which is founded on His positive self-revelation) and of His people. The help of the heathen king in David's Zion-buildings (and so in Solomon's Temple) sets forth the great truth that all the art and treasures of the lower, natural world are to be subservient to the higher world, which has entered humanity through the kingdom of God, and to contribute to the glorification of the name of God. Bähr on 1 Kings v. 15–32: "Israel was destined not to foster the arts, but to be the bearer of divine revelation, and to secure for all nations the knowledge of the *one* living and holy God; *thereto* had God chosen this people out of all peoples, and *therewith* is closely connected its manner of life and occupation, yea, its whole development and history. To the attainment of this its destiny the other nations had to contribute with the special gifts and powers which had been lent them. Israel, in spite of faults and errors, stood as high above the Phœnicians in the knowledge of the truth, as they above Israel in technic and artistic performances (comp. Duncker, *Gesch. u. Alterth.*, p. 317–320); distinguished as was Phœnicia for arts and industries, its religion was nevertheless the most perverted and its cultus the rudest (Duncker, *ubi sup.*, 155 sq.)."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 6–9. *The stronghold* on Mount Zion:* 1) How it is *gained: a*) by holy *war* against the enemies of God's kingdom; *b*) by holy *victory*, which God vouchsafes. 2) How it is *maintained: a*) in *defiance* of God's enemies, and *b*) as a *reliance* for God's friends.

Vers. 10–12. *The true kingdom by the grace of God:* 1) It is firmly founded through the Lord's power; 2) It grows and prospers under the Lord's blessing; 3) It renders subservient to itself the Lord's enemies; 4) It serves the Lord in the Lord's people.—Ver. 12. The true salutary relation between government and people rests on two things: 1) That the people recognize the authorities as set over them by God's grace, and honor them. 2) That the authorities regard themselves as constituted by God only for the people's welfare, and fulfil their calling to that end.

Vers. 17–25. *The war-counsel from on high:* 1) How it is *inquired after*—by looking above. 2) How it is *imparted*—by the voice from above. 3) How it is *carried out*—by help from above.—*Victory comes from the Lord:* 1) When it is beforehand humbly asked for according to the Lord's *will* and *word;* 2) When the battle is undertaken in the Lord's *name* and for His *cause;* 3) When it is fought with obedient observation of the Lord's *directions* and *guidance*.

The Lord will go out before thee (ver. 24): 1) A word of *consolation* in sore distress; 2) A word of *encouragement* amid inward conflict; 3) A word of *exhortation* to unconditional obedience of faith; 4) A word of *assurance* of the victory which the Lord gives.

The rustling of the Lord's approaching help in the tops of the trees (ver. 24): 1) Dost thou wait for it at His bidding? 2) Dost thou hear it with the right heed? 3) Dost thou understand it in the right sense? 4) Dost thou follow it without delay?

* [There is here an allusion to Luther's famous hymn, *Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott.*—Tr.]

Vers. 6–9. KRUMMACHER: David dwells now in Mount Zion, the crown of the land, and from here on begins the history of Jerusalem, which as the history of a city has not its like in grandeur, in change of fortunes, and in importance for the whole world.—Now exalted to heaven, now cast down to hell, thrice destroyed to the foundations and always rising again from the ruins, now given up to the heathen, plundered, covered with shame, and then again crowned with the highest honors, the city stands on its seven hills amid the cities of the earth as a high seven-branched candlestick, from which shines forth into the world both the consuming flame of God's holiness and justice, and the mild and blessed light of the divine long-suffering, love, compassion and covenant-faithfulness.—Ver. 6 sq. S. SCHMID: In that which God has commanded, we must not look to what others have done before us, but to God's command (1 Sam. xv. 22, 23).—SCHLIER: The Lord, who delivered Jerusalem's stronghold into David's hand, still lives to-day, and will, so far as it is good for us, always help us still in every time of need, and well is it for all them that trust in Him.

Ver. 10. [HENRY: Those that have the Lord of hosts for them need not fear what hosts of men or devils can do against them. Those who grow great must ascribe it to the presence of God with them, and give Him the glory of it.—TR.]—BERL. BIBLE: The world thinks little of it when it is said, God be with a man. But it is assuredly no trifle, it is the greatest of all things, for one to have with him the God of all the hosts of heaven and earth.—KRUMMACHER: O blessed is the man on whose heart nothing so presses as this, that in all his doings he may be with God and God with him.—Ver. 11. CRAMER: A glorious testimony that even the heathen will serve Christ.—STARKE: God knows how to incline towards pious rulers the minds of neighboring princes and kings, so that they may show them all friendly good-will (Prov. xxi. 1).—Ver. 12. J. LANGE: Great lords exist for the sake of their subjects, not these for their sake: O that the fact might be recognized!—[Vers. 13–16. SCOTT: Alas! even good men are apt to grow secure and self-indulgent in prosperity, and to sanction by their example those abuses which they should oppose or repress; and all our returns for the Lord's mercies are deeply tinged with ingratitude.—TR.]

Ver. 17. SCHLIER: Then might David clearly enough see that there is appointed to man no true resting-time upon earth. David's life was a warfare, and from one strife it went on into another, and when he thought to have found rest, then battle and strife began anew. Our life upon earth is not yet the resting-time; what awaits us is strife and warfare.—CRAMER: The pious never cease to encounter opposition; therefore whoever wishes to be pious, let him prepare for this (Luke xiv. 28).—KRUMMACHER: The old enemy of Israel stood again in arms upon the plain. God the Lord knows how to mingle always with the encouragements which He gives His friends so much also of the humbling as suffices to secure them against the danger of losing their equilibrium.

Ver. 19 sqq. SCHLIER: Whatever we undertake then, we must look to the Lord in beginning it, and it should be to us a matter of earnest concern that we may really have the Lord's word and will on our side.—So long as we have a good cause, we too may comfort ourselves with the help of the Lord; but what does it help if we pray and have a bad cause, or use God's word, and yet do not walk in the Lord's ways! God's word and prayer make no bad cause good, but help only when we undertake a good, God-pleasing work. And there is one more thing we must not overlook if we wish really to have the Lord's help, namely, that we must be acting only and entirely for the Lord's cause and honor. How did it stand, properly speaking, between Israel and the Philistines? On the one side was the Lord, and on the other the idols; there was the Lord's people, and here an idolatrous or heathen people. So the conflict was the cause of the Lord; the Lord's name and kingdom was in question; David's defeat would have been the Lord's defeat; a victory for David was the Lord's victory.

Ver. 20. BERL. BIBLE: David will not agree that the honor of the victory which he has gained by the help of God's goodness shall be ascribed to him, but rather to God.—CRAMER: Believers when they have been rescued from distress should heartily thank God for it, and recognize that the victory comes from Him; for He fights for His Church (Ps. l. 15; cxv. 1).—Ver. 21. BERL. BIB.: Men do not commonly let their idols go until they have been smitten by God, and do not quite let them go even then.

Vers. 23–25. KRUMMACHER: It rustles in the tops of the baca-trees, as if an invisible host were passing over them. We know what this meant for him. Nothing less than what was once meant for Jacob by his dream of the heavenly ladder, for Moses by the burning bush that was not consumed, for Elijah by the still, small voice on Horeb, and for Saul by the light which shone round him from heaven. The Lord was near and would go out for him.—BERL. BIBLE: God Himself gives to those who tranquilly trust in Him to know His will, and also places them in a position to be able to carry it out.—KRUMMACHER: The word of the Lord: "As soon as thou shalt hear the rustling in the tops . . . bestir thyself," applies figuratively to us also in our spiritual conflict with the children of unbelief in the world. There too it comes to nothing that one should make war with his own prowess and merely in the human equipment of reason and science. Success can only be reckoned on when the conflict is waged amid the blowing of the Holy Spirit's breath and with the immediate gracious presence of the Lord and of the truth of His word.—[HENRY: But observe, though God promised to go before them and smite the Philistines, yet David, when he heard the sound of this going, must bestir himself, and be ready to pursue the victory. God's grace must quicken our endeavors. Phil. ii. 12, 13.—TR.]

[Vers. 6, 7. Men are prone to rely on strong fortifications, so as to feel no fear of successful attack, and no need of help from God. So at a later period the men of the southern kingdom were at ease in this same Zion, and those of the northern kingdom trusted in the mountain of

Samaria, which was also a very strong place, and neither Judah nor Israel felt that their help came from Jehovah (Amos vi. 1-8). The same principle applies as to all reliance on mere human agencies, without recognizing our dependence on God; for example, on religious societies and boards, eloquent preachers, active pastors, famous revivalists, beautiful houses of worship, *etc.*—Tr.]

[Ver. 12. *A good man in great prosperity.* 1) He ascribes it all to the Lord. 2) He regards it as given him for the benefit of his fellow-men. (This is the text of Maurice's Sermon on "David the King," see "*Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament.*"—Tr.]

[Ver. 17 sqq. The Philistines could conquer Saul, who had been forsaken by God for his disobedience; but they only stimulate David to fulfil his divine calling (iii. 18), and to seek divine guidance (ver. 19).—Tr.]

[Ver. 24. In like manner, when we perceive signs of the Spirit's special presence among us, we should bestir ourselves to secure the blessed results.—Tr.]

[Chap. v. *King David's first years of sunshine.* After struggling through so many years of darkness, he now gains 1) a new crown, vers. 1-3; 2) a new capital, vers. 6-9; 3) a new palace, ver. 11; 4) new victories over the old enemy, vers. 17-25; and in them all, 5) new proofs of Jehovah's favor, vers. 2, 10, 22, 19, 24.—Tr.]

III. *Solemn transfer of the Ark to Mount Zion and establishment of regular divine service.*

Chapter VI. 1-23.

1 Again David [And David again[1]] gathered together all the chosen men of
2 Israel, thirty thousand. And David arose and went with all the people that were
with him from Baale of Judah, to bring up from thence the ark of God, whose
name is called by the name of the Lord of hosts that dwelleth *between* the cherubims [which is called by the name of Jehovah of hosts who sitteth on the cheru-
3 bim].[2] And they set [transported] the ark of God upon a new cart, and brought
it out of the house of Abinadab that was in Gibeah [on the hill]; and Uzzah and
4 Ahio, the sons of Abinadab, drave [led] the new cart. And they brought it out
of the house of Abinadab which was at Gibeah [on the hill] [*om.* And . . . Gibeah][3]
5 accompanying [with] the ark of God, and Ahio went before the ark. And David
and all the house of Israel played before the Lord [Jehovah] on all manner of
instruments made of firwood [with all their might, with songs][4] even [and] on harps
[lyres] and on psalteries and on timbrels and on cornets [sistra] and on cymbals.
6 And when they came to Nachon's[5] threshing-floor, Uzzah put forth *his hand* to

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. Wellhausen supposes that עוֹד came from the misunderstanding of יֹּסֶף, as if the verb were from יסף, which regularly takes עוֹד (comp. 1 Sam. xviii. 29); but see the explanation in the Exposition.—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 2. So substantially Cahen, Wellhausen, *Bib. Com.*; Philippson repeats the word "name," and Erdmann renders: "where (שָׁם) is invoked the name of the Lord of hosts, who is enthroned on the cherubim over it."—It is clear, however, that עָלָיו is the complement of the Rel. אֲשֶׁר. and the second שֵׁם is better omitted with Sept., Vulg., Chald., Arab., and one MS. of Kennicott. As to the number of words between the Rel. and its complement, such a massing up of dependent phrases is unusual, but not impossible; and the sentence may have been originally simpler (as Wellh. suggests) אֲשֶׁר נִקְ׳ שֵׁם ״ עָלָיו, and the appositional phrase afterwards added.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 4. This clause is omitted by Erdmann (so Sept.). But it is doubtful whether the whole verse had not better be omitted (as in 1 Chron. xiii.), for it adds nothing to the preceding. In that case the last clause might be regarded as a marginal explanation which early got into the text.—Thenius thinks that the incorrect repetition of the first clause has occasioned the dropping out of the words: "and Uzzah went," before the words: "with the ark of God," and Wellh. adds that it has also occasioned the change of the appellative אָחִיו, "his brother," into the proper name, אַחְיוֹ, "Ahio."—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 5. This is the reading in 1 Chron. xiii. 8. Sept.: בִּכְלֵי עֹז.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 6. Aq. ἕως ἅλωνος ἑτοίμης, and so substantially Böttcher and Erdmann: "to a ready (fixed) threshing-floor;" but this is less probable than the rendering of Eng. A. V. as a proper name. It is no objection to this that this word does not occur elsewhere as a proper name. The form in Chr. כִּידוֹן is thought by Wellh. to be the same as the last syllable of this: — כּרן — כון; but this is improbable.—Tr.]

7 the ark of God and took hold of it, for the oxen shook it. And the anger of the
Lord [Jehovah] was kindled against Uzzah, and God smote him there for *his*
8 error;[6] and there he died [he died there] by the ark of God. And David was dis-
pleased because the Lord [Jehovah] had made a breach upon Uzzah; and he
9 called the name of the [that] place[7] Perez-uzzah to this day. And David was
afraid of the Lord [Jehovah] that day, and said, How shall the ark of the Lord
10 [Jehovah] come to me? So David would not remove the ark of the Lord [Jeho-
vah] unto him into[8] the city of David, but David carried it aside into the house of
11 Obed-edom the Gittite. And the ark of the Lord [Jehovah] continued in the
house of Obed-edom the Gittite three months; and the Lord [Jehovah] blessed
Obed-edom[9] and all his household.

12 And it was told king David, saying, The Lord [Jehovah] hath blessed the house
of Obed-edom and all that pertaineth unto him, because of the ark of God. So
[And] David went and brought up the ark of God from the house of Obed-edom
13 into the city of David with gladness. And[10] it was so [it came to pass] that when
they that bare the ark of the Lord [Jehovah] had gone six paces, he sacrificed
14 oxen and fatlings. And David danced before the Lord [Jehovah] with all his
15 might; and David was girded with a linen ephod. So [And] David and all the
house of Israel brought up the ark[11] of the Lord [Jehovah] with shouting and
with the [*om.* the] sound of the [*om.* the] trumpet.

16 And as the ark of the Lord [Jehovah] came into the city of David, Michal,
Saul's daughter, looked through a [the] window, and saw king David leaping and
17 dancing before the Lord [Jehovah]; and she despised him in her heart. And
they brought in the ark of the Lord [Jehovah] and set it in his [its] place in the
midst of the tabernacle that David had pitched for it; and David offered burnt-
18 offerings[12] and peace-offerings[12] before the Lord [Jehovah]. And as soon as David
had made [And David made] an end of offering [*ins.* the] burnt-offerings and
[*ins.* the] peace-offerings, [*ins.* and] he blessed the people in the name[13] of the
19 Lord [Jehovah] of hosts. And he dealt among [dealt out to] all the people, *even*
among [to] the whole multitude of Israel, as well to the women as [*ins.* to the]
men, to every one a cake of bread and a good [*om.* good] piece *of flesh*[14] and a flagon
of wine [a raisin-cake]; so [and] all the people departed every one to his house.

20 And David returned to bless his household. And Michal, the daughter of Saul,
came out to meet David, and said, How glorious was [*om.* was] the king of Israel
[*ins.* made himself] to-day, who uncovered himself to-day in the eyes of the hand-
maids of his servants, as one of the vain fellows shamelessly[15] uncovereth himself!

[6] [Ver. 7. עַל־הַשַּׁל, an obscure phrase. Ewald: "unexpectedly" (comp. Dan. viii. 25; Job xv. 21); some Greek VSS. give ἐπὶ τῇ προπετείᾳ, ἐπὶ τῇ ἐκνοίᾳ; Erdmann and others as Eng. A. V., which is a doubtful meaning, and besides the suffix would then be required. Our phrase might be a fragment of the phrase in Chron.: עַל אֲשֶׁר שָׁלַח (so *Bib. Com.* and others). Chald. as Eng. A. V.; Vulg. *super temeritate* (so margin of Eng. A. V.).—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 8. Some MSS. have שֵׁם הַמָּקוֹם.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 10. עַל, "on," since the city was on a hill (but many MSS. have אֶל).—בֵּית indicates the point reached by motion, the Prep. being omitted, as is frequent.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 11. Some MSS. have "the house of Obed-edom," and others add "the Gittite."—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 13. Here and elsewhere Aquila renders אָרוֹן by γλωσσοκόμον. Sept. has ἐν ὀργάνοις ἡρμοσμένοις for בְּכָל־עֹז in ver. 14 (see ver. 5). It is difficult to see how it gets its translation: "and there were with him seven choruses bearing the ark," unless it takes צְעָדִים (steps) concretely as — "persons going or marching;" what follows: καὶ θῦμα μόσχος καὶ ἄρνες. is also strange.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 15. Some MSS.: "ark of the covenant of Jehovah."—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 17. Without the Art. since the number is not given, and the statement is indefinite; but in the following verse, since the nouns are then defined by previous mention, the Art. is used.—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 18. בְּשֵׁם.—Sym.: διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος, Aq. ἐν ὀνόματι.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 19. Erdmann: "a measure (of wine)," Aq., Sym. ἀμυρίτην (perhaps ἀμυλίτην from ἄμυλος — "fine meal"), obscure, Sept. ἐχαρίτην, perhaps — אֶשְׁכָּר, Vulg. *assaturam bubulæ carnis unam*, "a roast of ox-flesh."—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 20. This adverb in Eng. A. V. is intended to express the force of the second Inf. here; the construction is noticed by Erdmann. Supposing the second Inf. to be genuine and intensive, the meaning would be: "really, thoroughly uncovers," to which Eng. A. V. corresponds substantially.—Tr.]

21 **And David said unto Michal, *It was* [*om.* it was] before the Lord [Jehovah] which
[who] chose me before thy father and before all his house, to appoint me ruler
[prince] over the people of the Lord [Jehovah], over Israel—therefore will I play
22 [yea, I have played] before the Lord [Jehovah]. And I will yet be more [be yet
more] vile than thus, and will be base in mine own sight; and of the maid-servants
23 which [whom] thou hast spoken of, of them shall I be had in honor. Therefore
[And] Michal the daughter of Saul had no child[16] unto the day of her death.**

[16] [Ver. 23. Keth. יֶלֶד, Qeri וֶלֶד, written in Gen. xi. 30 וָלָד, which is the older form. Böttcher: "This is one of the few examples of the retention by the punctuators of an archaism in the older book, and its correction in the later."—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

[Parallel with 2 Sam. vi. is 1 Chr. xiii., xv., xvi.—Tr.]

Ver. 1. ***Assembly of all the chosen men in Israel.***—"David *assembled*."* Thenius renders: "and David *increased* again all the chosen men;" but against this is that nothing has been before said of the *numbers* of the army (as the "again" would then imply), and that such a completely isolated statement of the augmentation of the standing army would be very strange, [and further this rendering would not agree with the expression "*all* the chosen men."—Tr.].—The ancient VSS. all have: "assembled."—The expression "all the chosen men" can be understood (as in Judg. xvi. 34; xx. 15; 1 Sam. xxiv. 3) only of the *military* men chosen expressly for service of war, not of a chosen body identical (according to 1 Chr. xiii. 1–5) with the captains of thousands, *etc.*, that is, with the representation of the nation in stocks and families (Keil), for the term "chosen" (בָּחוּר) could not be so employed. And for this reason the word "again" cannot refer to the non-military assembly of the Elders in v. 1, 3, against which further is, that *David* did not convoke that body, while it is here said that "David again gathered," and that that assembly lay too far back of the two gatherings of the military population for the Philistine wars described just before [ch. v.]. Rather the "again" refers to this latter assemblage of the *military* men, which is obviously presupposed in the immediately preceding narrative. Thus ver. 1 by the "again" and the "all the chosen men" connects itself immediately with what precedes, while it introduces what follows: for why should David not have brought up the ark with an army of thirty thousand men (against Thenius)? The exhibition of such military pomp accorded perfectly with the importance of the ark for the whole people, whose *élite* in these "hearts of oak" [Germ. kernel- or core-warriors] (Ew. *Gr.* § 290 *c*) the more appropriately took the first place in the solemn procession, since it was their victory over the Philistines that made the transference of the ark possible. Besides, a military escort might be necessary to guard against a new attack of the enemy.—We learn from this "that David already in a certain sort maintained a standing army" (Then.).—The Sept. has seventy instead of thirty thousand, supposing, no doubt, that the *whole* military force of all Israel was here assembled, a supposition that is excluded by the phrase "*chosen* men." [The consultation of David with the leaders in 1 Chr. xiii., and the assembling of "all Israel" (that is, probably, through its representatives) is not inconsistent with the statement here. The Chronicler brings out prominently details of organization, especially religious, "Samuel" gives the simplest historical narration.—Tr.]

Vers. 2–10. *David's march to fetch the ark from Kirjath-jearim.*—Ver. 2. **And David went with all the people that were with him.**—These are not the above-named thirty thousand chosen warriors, but, besides them, the representatives of the whole nation gathered to the festival, as described in 1 Chr. xiii. 1–16, where nothing is said of a military body, while here in our passage the preliminary conference with the heads of families is passed over, and only a summary statement made in reference to the accompaniment of the ark by the people. The expression "*from* Baale" is strange, since nothing has before been said of David's going thither. But we cannot make the Prep. (מִן) = "to" (Dathe), nor regard the phrase as definitive of the preceding "all the people," as do the ancient VSS. (Sept. "of the rulers of Judah," Vulg. "of the men of Judah," and so Luther "of the citizens of Judah")—the latter view is untenable because the designation of *place* presupposed in the expression "from thence" would then be wanting. From what follows "Baale-Judah" can be nothing but the *place Kirjath-jearim* (comp. 1 Chr. xiii. 6) whither the ark was carried according to 1 Sam. vi. 21; vii. 1, = *Kirjath-baal*, Josh. xv. 60; xviii. 14; *Baalah*, Josh. xv. 9; 1 Chr. xiii. 6. This original Canaanitish name continued along with the Israelitish. See Josh. xviii. 14, "Kirjath-baal, that is, Kirjath-jearim, *the city of the children of Judah;*" to this last name answers here Baale-*Judah*, whereby this city is distinguished from others of like name, Baal or Baalah in Simeon (Josh. xix. 8; 1 Chr. iv. 33) and in Dan (Josh. xix. 44). It lay on the border between Judah and Benjamin, westward on the border of the latter tribe and about eight miles west of Jerusalem [identified by Rob. with the modern Kuryet el-Enab or Abu Gosh, on the road from Jerusalem to Jaffa.—Tr.].—Since, now, the Prep. "from" cannot well be taken (with Keil) to be an ancient clerical error, we may either suppose that the writer here gives a very condensed narrative, not mentioning David's march to Baalah, because he took it for granted in relating what was to him the chief matter, the bringing of the ark thence (Kimchi, Maurer), or, if such a condensation seems too

* יֹסֵף for אֹסֵף—יַאֲסֵף (as in 1 Sam. xv. 6; Mic. iv. 6, Ps. civ. 29), comp. Ew. § 139 *b*, Ges. § 68, *Rem.* 2; it is Impf. of אָסַף [not of יָסַף "to increase"].

hard, we must suppose a lacuna in the text. Thenius thinks it probable that it originally read "to Kirjath-jearim of the citizens of Judah," = "children of Judah," Josh. xviii. 14 (קִרְיַת יְעָרִים בְּ') and the two first words except the last letter (ם) have fallen out. This, as explaining how the Prep. (מִן) came into the text, seems better than the conjecture of Lud. Capell. (*Crit. Sac.* I. 9, § 8), who supplies the words of 1 Chr. xiii. 6 "to Baalah, to Kirjath-jearim, which is to Judah," or that of Bertheau (and Ewald) "Baalah, it (הִיא), is K., which is to Judah." [It seems a difficulty in the way of Thenius' ingenious restoration that the word בַּעַל in the sense of "citizen, inhabitant" is found only with names of cities, not of countries. This, if correct, will also set aside Wellhausen's explanation of the Prep. (מִן), that it arose from a misunderstanding of בַּעֲלֵי, which was taken = "citizens or inhabitants." Perhaps the מ is clerical error for ל, the two letters being not very unlike in their ancient forms.—Tr.]. **To bring up thence the ark of God.**—The rest of the verse is descriptive of the "ark of God," but opinions vary as to the exact sense. The rendering (connecting אֲשֶׁר with עָלָיו): "on which (ark) the name, the name of Jehovah . . . is called" (Keil) or "called on" (De Wette), has against it that "there is no example of *so many* words between the Rel. and its complement" (Then.), and the strangeness of this repetition of the "name" [which is written twice in the Heb. —Tr.]. The translation: "which (ark) is called the name" (Kimchi, and also Bunsen: which is called *by* name [whose name is called] . . .), is untenable because the ark itself is never so called; equally insufficient is Keil's explanation of his translation: "over which the name of Jehovah is named," that is, above which Jehovah reveals His glory, for the verb "is called or named" must be referred not to Jehovah, but to the human naming of Jehovah's name. Also to Ewald's view, who refers the Relative to "God," and translates "He was named with the name" (*Gr.* § 284 *c*) the twice-recurring "name" is an objection. It is better, therefore, to render (with Cler., Maur., Then., Berth.): "where the name of the Lord of hosts . . . is invoked" (reading שָׁם for שֵׁם). Usually indeed the verb "call" is followed by the Prep. בְּ (in, on) when it means "invoke," but it is found without this Prep., Ps. xcix. 6, and Lam. iii. 55; and though there was no invocation of the Lord's name at the ark itself (since none was permitted to approach it), yet the place where it stood was doubtless a place of divine worship.* "Who is enthroned on the Cherubim," that is, is present with His ruling power in the midst of His people; the expression is never used except in relation to the ark; see on 1 Sam. iv. 4. "Who is enthroned on the Cherubim *above it*† (the ark)." [On the text of this verse see "Text. and Gram.—Tr.].—Ver. 3 sq. "*Set* it on the cart."* A "new cart" must be taken, because the sacred vessel was not permitted to come in contact with anything already desecrated by common use, comp. 1 Sam. vi. 7. "And brought it out;" according to the above translation ("set") there is no need of rendering this verb as Pluperf. "had brought" (Then.).—Carrying the ark on a cart was contrary to the legal requirement (Num. vii. 9), according to which it was always to be *borne* by the Levites. "The Hebrews here probably imitated a Phœnician or Philistine custom. The Phœnicians, namely, seem to have had sacred carts, on which they carried about their gods (Münter, *Relig. der Karthager*, p. 120), and the oxen were sacred to Baal (p. 15)." (Stähl., David p. 39). See 1 Sam. vi. 7. **Out of the house of Abinadab on the hill,** comp. 1 Sam. vii. 1 sq. According to this passage Abinadab's son Eleazar was entrusted with the oversight of the ark; here we find "*Uzza and Ahio*" mentioned as Abinadab's sons, and as driving the cart in charge of the ark. The ark had been about seventy years in Abinadab's house, twenty years up to the victory of Ebenezer (1 Sam. vii. 1 sq.), forty years under Samuel and Saul, and about ten years under David. Thus the statement that Uzza and Ahio led the ark may (as Keil remarks) be explained without difficulty. "Either these two sons were born about or after the time that the ark was deposited in his house, or the word 'sons' is used in the wider sense of 'grandsons,' as is often the case" (Keil).—*Text-criticism of ver.* 4. By the mistake of a transcriber, whose eye wandered at the words נֹהֲגִים אֶת־ה' back to אֶל־ע' חֲדָשָׁה, the words from הד' to בַּגִּבְעָה were repeated, and are to be omitted. Only thus is the omission of the Art. in the second חד' to be explained. [That is, omit the "new" at the close of ver. 3, and in ver. 4 omit the first clause ending with "Gibeah." Some read ver. 4 thus: "and Uzza went with the ark of God, and Ahio (or, his brother) went before the ark," which gives a good sense. The whole verse is omitted in Chron. See "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

Ver. 5. Whilst *Ahio* went *before* the ark, and *Uzza* went *alongside* it (ver. 6)—perhaps in ver. 4 the words "and Uzza went" have fallen out before "with the ark of God" (De Wette, Then., Buns.)—the whole procession, David at the head, moves forward with music, song and dance. **The whole house of Israel,** see vers. 1, 2. **Before the Lord,** whose presence was symbolized by the ark itself. "Sporting," that is, *playing* (see Judg. xvi. 25) and *dancing* (see ver. 14). The Heb. word (צִחֵק ,שִׂחֵק) is the general expression for dancing in its connection with vocal and instrumental music, 1 Sam. xviii. 7; xxi. 11; 1 Chr. xiii. 8; xv. 29; Jer. xxx. 19; xxxi. 4; Prov. viii. 30 sq.—The words of the Heb. text "with all manner of cypress-woods" make no sense; for what signifies the mention of the material, of which the instruments were afterwards made? The Sept. and Vulg. (ἐν ὀργάνοις ἡρμοσμένοις "with fitted instruments," in *omnibus lignis fa-*

* The אֲשֶׁר־שָׁם refers back to the מִשָּׁם. So in 1 Chr. xiii. 6 this invocation is mentioned, if we read שָׁם for שֵׁם at the end.

† עָלָיו belongs to יֹשֵׁב, but there is no need to supply אֲשֶׁר in reference to "Cherubim" (Then.).

* הִרְכִּיב as 2 Kings xxiii. 30; comp. 2 Kings xiii. 16.

brefactis "with all manufactured woods") presuppose indeed this reading; but the Sept. has also another reading "with might and with songs," to which answer the corresponding words in Chron. (ver. 8): "with all their might and with songs." [This reading of Chron. is now generally adopted here, though not by the Jewish expositors Philippson and Cahen, who retain the text of "Samuel."—TR.] With the expression "with all might" comp. ver. 14: "and David danced with all (his) might." On the connection of *song* with festive dance and instrumental music see on 1 Sam. xviii. 6, 7. The timbrel (tabret, hand-drum תֹּף) or Aduffe [Arab. and Pers. duff or diff, Span. adufe] was used by the virgins to give the time in dancing.—The *menana* [incorrectly "cornet" in Eng. A. V.] is an instrument that gave forth a melodious tone when shaken to musical time (from נוּעַ "to shake"), the sistrum (σεῖστρον) of the ancients.—"Cymbals," smaller or larger metal-plates, which when struck together gave a clear sound.* Chron. has "trumpets" in place of "sistra;" the two accounts are doubtless mutually complementary (Keil). [On these instruments see the *Bib.-Dicts.*—TR.]

Ver. 6. **And when they came to a fixed threshing-floor.**—*Nachon* (נָכוֹן) is not to be taken (with many expositors [and Eng. A. V.]) as a proper name, since it never so occurs; nor is it = "threshing-floor of the blow" (נָכָה Mov., Keil), for the word is always found as a Pass. Partcp. (Niph.), and cannot be derived from the Qal [simple Active] of the verb "smite" (נכה), which never occurs; besides, in that case, as Böttcher rightly remarks, "the name would not be connected with Perez (ver. 8)." *Nachon* (from כון) = "a *fixed* threshing-floor, which did not change its place like the summer floor (Dan. ii. 35), and therefore probably had a roof and a stock of fodder" (Böttch.). Chron. has "threshing-floor of destruction" (Kidon, כִּידוֹן = כִּיד Job xxi. 10, destruction, properly blow, plaga = Ar. *caid*), a designation that probably has its origin in the succeeding narrative. Later the name Perez-uzza came into use instead of these appellations. It is not necessary to insert in the Heb. the words "his hand" (יָדוֹ) after the verb "put forth," for the verb is found alone in Ps. xxii. 17; for example, comp. with Ps. xviii. 17; Obad. 13. [*Bib.-Com.:* the word *reach* is so used in Eng. without a following *hand.*—TR.]. **Uzza reached out to the ark of God and took hold of it,** namely, to keep it from falling over or down; **for the oxen shook, jostled it** (שָׁמְטוּ), according to the usual signification of the verb,—not "ran away" (Ges. Dietr.), or "had gotten loose" (De Wette), nor "had thrown it down" (Böttch., Then.), since according to the narrative Uzza wished to save it from falling by laying hold of it. Ewald: "they jostled the ark so that it seemed about to fall off." [The Acc. Pron., not expressed in the Heb., is easily supplied from the connection.—TR.]

Ver. 7. "God smote him for the error." [Erdmann thus agrees in this translation with Eng. A. V., Abarb., Philipps., Keil, Chald.; the difficulty is stated in "Text. and Gram." Some render "for his rashness," some "unawares," and others adopt the reading in 1 Chr. xiii. 10. Consult Kennicott's "*Dissertation*," p. 456, Levy's *Chald. Dict. s. v.* שְׁלִי, Wellhausen's "*Text Samuelis.*"—TR.]. The error consisted in touching the ark, which as the symbol of God's presence (1 Sam. iv. 7), none could look at (Num. iv. 20; 1 Sam. vi. 19), much less lay hold of, without peril of life. For transportation, therefore, it was first covered up by the Levites to whom it was committed (especially the Kohathites, Num. vii. 9), and that with faces covered (Num. iv. 15, 20), and carried on staves which constantly projected (Ex. xxv. 14, 15).—Instead of this brief statement of the offence, Chron. has the descriptive periphrasis: "because he had put out his hand to the ark," which is followed by Syr. and Arab. A suddenly fatal apoplectic stroke was the natural means of the manifestation of the divine anger at Uzza's violation of the majesty of the holy God symbolized in the ark of the covenant.—Ver. 8. "And David was angry that the Lord had made a breach (or inflicted a stroke) on Uzza;" not "was amazed (confounded)," for the verb is always used of anger, the angry person being introduced with the Prep. לְ [= to], 2 Sam. xix. 43; 1 Sam. xv. 11; Gen. xviii. 30, 32; xxxi. 36. The cause of his anger or angry excitement is not the deed of Uzza, but the deed of God, the slaying of Uzza, in so far as he was obliged to look on himself as the cause of this punishment through his non-observance of the legal prescription concerning the transportation of the ark; for the ark was to be borne, not ridden, and touching it was forbidden on pain of death (Num. iv. 15). "To this day" this name had continued the only one in use in commemoration of this occurrence, [that is, up to the writer's time, which was at some considerable remove from the event referred to.—TR.].—Ver. 9. While David is *angry* at this justly-incurred misfortune, his heart is filled with *fear* of the Lord. **How shall the ark of the Lord come to me?**—This question indicates the ground and object of David's fear of the Lord; in view of what had happened on the touching of the ark, he feels himself guilty before the Lord and unworthy of His presence; he fears to be similarly stricken, if he now bring the ark to him into Zion.—Ver. 10. The procession was broken up, and the effort to bring the ark to Zion abandoned; **he carried it aside into the house of Obed-edom the Gittite.**—*Obed-edom*, a Levite of the stock of the Korahites, which was a branch of the family of Kohath (Ex. vi. 16, 18, 21), a "son of Jeduthun" (1 Chr. xvi. 38), appears afterwards as a porter in Jerusalem, and also acts as musician in the transference of the ark (1 Chr. xv. 18, 21, 24; xvi. 5). He is called "Gittite" not from a former protracted residence in the Philistine city Gath (Vatabl.), but from Gath-Rimmon, the Levitical city in Dan. (Cler.), Josh. xxi. 24; xix. 45, where he was no doubt born. Since he was of the Korahites, who were porters during the march through the wilderness, we can the more readily understand how the ark was carried to him. [If *Jeduthun* is the same as

* Instead of our צֶלְצְלִים Chron. has מְצִלְתַּיִם, see Ps. cl. 5.

Ethan (comp. 1 Chr. xv. 17, 19 with xvi. 41, 42; xxv. 1, 3, 6; 2 Chr. xxxv. 15) then Obed-edom, the son of Jeduthun, was a Merarite. There may, however, have been several of the name. 1 Chr. xxv. 15 is supposed by some to establish the identity of our Obed-edom with the Jeduthunite, though this cannot be said to be certain. If the two are the same, it is suggested that, "though a Merarite by birth, marriage with a Kohathite would account for his dwelling in a Kohathite city." The question can hardly be certainly decided. His name is peculiar, apparently = "serving (servant of) Edom." It is suggested (Wellh.) that Edom is here the name of a god, to which the objection is that there is no trace elsewhere of such a deity, the name occurring only as a gentilic one, and in connection with Esau. It having been shown by Erdmann that the man Obed-edom was a Levite, it may be surmised either that he was a foreigner adopted by marriage into the tribe of Levi, or, more probably, that he, or some ancestor of his, had once been in servitude to the Edomites.—See *Bib.-Com. in loco.*—Tr.]

Vers. 11-19. [1 Chron. xiii. 14; xv., xvi.]. *Transference of the Ark from the house of Obed-edom to the City of David.*—Ver. 11 sq. **Three months the Ark remained in the house of Obed-edom.**—After the words "with the house of Obed-edom," Chron. has "in its house," "in order to maintain the dignity of the sacred vessel" (Then.). The *blessing* on Obed-edom's house and possessions (comp. *Jos. Ant.* 7, 4, 2)* "for the ark of God's sake," that is, by reason of God's gracious presence in His majesty and glory, forms the contrast to that other revelation of God's anger [against Uzza] and to David's fear of misfortune and destruction from the presence of the ark, and now becomes the *occasion* of David's resolution to bring the ark to himself to Mount Zion. After the words (ver. 12): "because of the ark of God" the Vulg. has: "and David said, I will go and bring back the ark with blessing into my house," which is an explanation of what precedes in reference to Obed-edom's experience of blessing, as motive for bringing back the ark. [Wellhausen: "This addition in the Vulgate of 1590, which pragmatically connects the two facts which in the masoretic texts are merely collocated, does not belong to Jerome—see Vercellone *in loco*. It is found also in several Greek MSS. Against Thenius."—Tr.]. Chron. (xv. 1) connects this narrative with the preceding (the palace-building, xiv. 1 sq.) by the remark that David, while building houses in Jerusalem, prepared a place for the ark of God and pitched a tent for it. **And David went and brought up the ark of God from the house of Obed-edom** (which was not necessarily near Perez-Uzza, but lay perhaps on the outskirts of the Lower City) **into the city of David** "with gladness," in glad procession, with festive joy, comp. Gen. xxxi. 27; Neh. xii. 43.—Ver. 13. Since *bearers* of the ark are spoken of, it appears that David now observed the prescription of the Law. In 1 Chr. xxv. 2 sq. David declares that no one should bear the ark but the Levites, because they were thereto chosen by God. The former procedure is thus expressly recognized as illegal (comp. Num. i. 40; iv. 15; vi. 9; x. 17). In Chron. we then find (vers. 2-13) the king's consultation with the priests and Levites about the legal performance of the solemn act of bringing up the ark, and (ver. 14 sq.) David's further regulations concerning the singing and instrumental music in the procession.—**And when the bearers of the ark of the Lord had made six steps, he sacrificed** (caused to be sacrificed) **an ox and a fat calf.**—De Wette renders wrongly: "And it came to pass, as often as they went six steps, he sacrificed;" the Heb. would not allow this rendering (it must then be וְהָיָה . . . וְזָבַח, Böttch.), and what a monstrous representation: such an offering every six steps! The meaning is that David, having arranged and started the procession, introduced and consecrated it with a sacrifice. "It was a thank-offering for the happy *beginning* and a petition for the prosperous *continuation* of the undertaking" (Böttch.). The halt after six steps is therefore not a "surprising fact" (Then.), nor need we suppose that the bearers stood "a *long* time" with the ark on their shoulders. The offering of seven bullocks and seven rams, which according to Chron. (xv. 26) was made by the Levites, was not the same with this, but a concluding thank-offering for the happy completion of the undertaking with the Lord's help (comp. ver. 25). [So also Patrick and Keil regard the sacrifice in 1 Chr. xv. 26; but it seems clear from the context that the same offering is here intended as in our passage, for the solemnity is not completed till ver. 28. It is no objection to this that David is the offerer in the one and the Levites in the other (Patr.), for David may have used the Levites as sacrificers (as Erdmann intimates); nor does the apparent difference in the animals make a serious difficulty, for the terms in "Samuel" may be collective, see Gen. xxxii. 6 (so Eng. A. V.), Chron. simply supplying the exact numbers, the special term "bullock" of Chron. may be included under the general "oxen" of "Samuel," and the "rams" under the somewhat indefinite "fatlings" (so Sept. and Vulg.). Or, if it be difficult to take the second word (מְרִיא) as collective, we may suppose a difference in the figures in the two accounts, such as is not infrequent.—Tr.].—Ver. 14. **And David danced with all his might before the Lord.**—The verb (Pilp. of כָּרַר, only here and ver. 16) = "to hop, spring, dance in a half circle," comp. the similar word for "camels, dromedaries" (כִּרְכָּרוֹת). Dances on festive occasions, as in thanksgiving for deliverances (Ex. xv. 20), for victory (Judg. xi. 34; xxi. 19; 1 Sam. xviii. 6) were commonly performed by women alone. The expression "*with all his might*" sets forth the high degree of David's joyful excitement, comp. ver. 5. "Before the Lord," that is, before the ark of the covenant as the symbol of the presence of the Lord as the king of His people.—**Girded with a** (white) **linen ephod.**—As elsewhere the white ephod was worn only by priests as a sign of their priestly character (1 Sam. xxii. 18), there was a special significance in David's wearing the *priestly* dress now; it lay, however, not in a desire on his part to represent himself, in honor of the Lord as head of the priestly people of Israel, but partly in the general priestly cha-

* [Josephus says (but probably without extra-biblical authority) that Obed-edom, from having been poor, became rich, and that people observed it.—Tr.]

racter that the kingly office of David and Solomon still continued to maintain at the head of the people, partly in David's priestly procedure in this festivity; he, as it were, performed the functions of a priest (Thenius), not merely in blessing the people (ver. 18), but also in conducting the whole procession and arranging the sacrifice. While the Chronicler gives elaborate information respecting the dress of David and the Levites, our narrator here confines himself to the statement that David was clothed with the white ephod. On the other hand, David's dancing is omitted by the Chronicler, not because it *offended* him from a priestly point of view (for he alludes to it in ver. 29, and mentions it xiii. 8 in agreement with 2 Sam. vi. 5), but because he here wished to bring out with special prominence the ritualistic side of the ceremony, for which the priestly dress was important. (See Keil *in loco*.) [It is suggested by some (see *Bib. Comm.*) that the first clause of 1 Chr. xv. 27, "and David was clothed with a robe of fine linen," is merely another form (possibly a corruption) of the text of "Samuel," "and David danced with all his might," especially as this same ver. 27 mentions the linen-ephod also. The Heb. letters in the two clauses are sufficiently alike to permit one to be derived from the other, and the context in Chron. is not against such a supposition. But it is impossible to say whether the one text is to be derived from the other, or, under such a supposition, which is the original. — Tr.]—Ver. 15. Comp. 1 Chr. xv. 28, where the names of the several instruments are given. Here we have briefly **with shouting and sound of trumpet.**—The Chron. draws full accounts from the common source, our author gives a summary statement. [On religious dances among the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans, see Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, Smith's *Dict. of Greek and Roman Ant.*, Arts. *Chorus* and *Saltatio*, and comp. Art. *Dance* in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*—Tr.]

Ver. 16. *Michal** is expressly called *Saul's daughter*, not *thereby* to characterize her as lacking in true-hearted piety (Keil), but to distinguish her in comparison with David's other wives, as highest in position. **She looked through the window**—that is, holds herself aloof from the procession,† and criticises David's conduct (as her remark proves) with a cold heart which had no part in his and the people's joyous inspiration. **When she saw the king leaping and dancing** (Chronicl.: dancing [=leaping] and playing), **she despised‡ him in her heart**—despised him on account of his presumed degradation of himself, to the shame of his royal dignity (ver. 20).—Ver. 17. The *tent* that David pitched for the ark being merely a covering on poles without a firm structure of boards, could have been only temporary, since David had the purpose to build a permanent sanctuary, a "house" to the Lord (chap. vii.). **Set it in its place in the midst of the tent.**—That is, in the space marked off according to the tabernacle which still stood in Gibeon, in the *Holy of Holies*. The *burnt-offerings* and *thank-offerings* that David now offered referred to this provisional sanctuary, and served to consecrate it. Of course he made the sacrifices not in his own person, but through the priests.—Ver. 18. The offerings being ended, **he blessed the people in the name of the Lord of Sabaoth.**—The *blessing* was not the Aaronic (Numb. vi. 22 sq.), which pertained only to the high-priest, but (like Solomon's, 1 Ki. viii. 55) a concluding benedictory address to the whole people. "The *name* of the Lord of Sabaoth" is the essential being of God, as it was exhibited in the fulness of all His revelations to His people. The benedictions find their fulfilment only in this self-revelation of God to His people as their source, which is at the same time the pledge for the fulfilment.—Ver. 19. The *entertainment* of the people. Each one, men and women, received a "bread-cake" (כִּכַּר = חַלַּת, 1 Chron. xvi. 3), a round cake, such as was baked for sacrificial meals, comp. Ex. xxix. 23 with Lev. viii. 24 sq. *Eshpar* [Eng. A. V.: good piece of flesh] occurs only here, is not = "piece of *flesh*,"* but probably to be derived from a verb "to measure" (Aeth. שׂפר, De Dieu, Gesenius, Rödiger, De Wette), and = a "*measure of wine*," which would not be too hard a suppletion [would not be supplying or understanding too much] (Thenius). The third term [Eng. A. V.: flagon of wine] means *raisin-cake*, or a mass of dried grapes pressed into a cake (Ges.), comp. Song of Songs ii. 5; Hos. iii. 1.—**Thereupon the people returned home.**—In like manner **David**, having finished the offering and the entertainment, **returned to his house to bless it** (ver. 20 *a*)—that is, to invoke on his house the blessings he had pronounced on the people, and (having finished this sacred act) to place it under the protection and blessing of the Lord, of whose presence in his house the ark standing near in the tent was the symbol. The close of verse 19 and the beginning of verse 20 are given at the end of the narrative, 1 Chron. xvi. 43.

Vers. 20–23. *Michal's pride and David's humility.*—Ver. 20. **And Michal came to meet David.**—The words here added by the Sept.: "and greeted him" are an insertion, which there is no ground for putting into the Hebrew text. **How glorious did the king of Israel make himself to-day!**—This bitterly ironical address with which David, returning joyfully to bless his house, is received by Michal, is the outburst of her wicked *feeling* (ver. 16). **Who uncovered himself to-day in the eyes of the handmaids of his servants.**—That is: exposed, degraded himself, obviously alluding to the fact that David had exchanged the royal robes proper to such an occasion for the light, comparatively short sacerdotal dress. She blames him not so much for dancing as that in such a procession and in such attire, forgetting his royal dignity, he min-

* וְהָיְתָה, as in 1 Sam. xvii. 48 and often in later books, for וַתְּהִי (comp. Ew. § 345 *b*)—"because there is no progress in the action, but we have merely the mention of an additional incident" (Keil).

† [But probably it was not expected that she and other members of the household (women) should take part in the procession (ver. 20).—Tr.]

‡ וַתִּבֶז with לְ, as verbs of inclination and hate often have the prepositional construction (love *to*, Lev. xix. 18; hate or contempt *towards*, Proverbs xvii. 5); Ewald, § 282 *c*.

* It is not (with most Rabbis) to be derived from אֵשׁ and פַּר.

gled with the common people and put himself on a level with them. **As one of the vain fellows uncovers* himself.**—"Worthless, bad fellows" (רֵיק) as Judg. ix. 4; xi. 3; Prov. xii. 11; Vulg.: "buffoons" (*scurris*), Sept.: "dancers" (ὀρχουμένων), which is an explanation instead of a translation. Observe the twofold definition of the degradation: "in the eyes of the *maids* of his *servants*" over against the reference to the *king of Israel*.

Ver. 21. *David's answer*.—**Before the Lord who chose me ...... and I have played before the Lord.**—We have here an anacolouthon, the long Rel. clause "who chose ... Israel" breaking the connection, which is then restored by "and [or yea] I have played," the phrase "before the Lord" (which stands at the beginning) being resumed. [On this verse see the English translation and "Text. and Gram."—Tr.] After the words "before Jehovah" Sept. inserts "I will dance; blessed be the Lord," and after "and I have played" [which it renders "I will play"] has "and I will dance," in order thus to relieve the anacolouthon, and to introduce the "dancing," which (though the object of Michal's blame) is strangely omitted [in the Heb.] in David's reply. In answer to Michal's cutting irony, which regards David's conduct merely from the point of view of its accordance with the dignity of "the king of Israel," and characterizes it as common and low, he affirms two things: 1) that in his procedure he had an eye only to the glory of God, and that it must therefore not be condemned as common and low, but rather recognized as holy and well-pleasing to God; and 2) that he received his kingdom and his position as king of Israel through the Lord's *choice* and *command*. He had therefore acted not counter to, but in accordance with this royal dignity, in that he gave the honor to the Lord, who had raised him from lowliness to this height. The expression "before the Lord" derives a very strong emphasis from its position at the beginning and at the end, and, thus repeated, indicates the holiest and highest point of view whence (in opposition to Michal's profane utterance) his procedure in this festival is to be judged and estimated. **Before thy father and before his whole house** says David, in order to repel the charge that he had thus lowered the royal dignity which had passed to him from Saul and his house, thus pointing also to the cause of the rejection of Saul and his house, namely, such haughtiness and pride as the "daughter of Saul" had here exhibited.—Ver. 22. "And I will be yet more vile." Instead of this Sept. has the nonsensical rendering: "and I will still thus uncover myself" (נִגְלָה)! The less reason then for changing the Heb. "in my eyes" into the Sept. "in thy eyes." Certainly David did not lower himself in *his own* eyes, that is. in *his* own judgment, by his playing and dancing (as Thenius, contrary to the text-reading, remarks)—not in the sense of Michal's charge; yet he did lower or humble himself in his own eyes in the sense that *he* expresses in ver. 21, where he describes his conduct as a self-abasement *before the presence of the Lord*. "In comparison with this" (that is, with this abasement before the Lord) he continues: **And I will be held** (= become) **yet more vile** (Niph. = Qal. as Gen. xvi. 4) **in my eyes.**—That is, in my own judgment will humble myself yet more than to-day. The expression "in my eyes" cannot be explained as = I will suffer still greater contempt from men than what I have just experienced." **And with the maids, of whom thou hast spoken, with them will I be held in honor.**—Ewald's explanation: "should I seek honor from them? no, that is not at all necessary" falls to the ground, since Michal's assertion that he had gotten himself honor was not serious, but ironical. Thenius: "*of* the maids shall I be held in honor" [so Eng. A. V.]—that is, they, the simple souls, will know better than thou how to estimate my humility, and this will compensate me for thy foolish contempt. But this latter is an interpolated thought, which would be farthest from David's soul at this moment of extreme humility before the *Lord*, and would savor of Michal's ideas about *human* honor. The "*honored*" here (obviously contrasted with Michal's "honored, made glorious," ver. 20) refers (as is clear from the throughout recurring words, "before the Lord") to the honor *in the sight of the Lord*, which will be given those who humble themselves before the Lord. David, having opposed to Michal's "in the eyes of the maids" his "in the presence of the Lord," places himself "before the Lord" on the same level with the maids, expressing by the repeated "*with*" his fellowship and equality with these humble folk, and pointing to the honor which he with them would have *before the Lord*, because he humbly showed due honor to the Lord. [The objection to this interpretation is that we should then expect David to say "I will (or shall) be honored by Jehovah," that is, the subject or agent of the honoring must be expressed, and is given in the text only by the word "maids." The Hebrew Prep. may mean "among" or "before" (apud), and thus permits the translation of Eng. A. V., Patr., Then., Philippson. Besides, in reply to Michal's sneer about the maids, it is a natural and sharp rejoinder on David's part to accept this honor which she regards as beneath contempt.—Tr.]—Ver. 23. Michal's childlessness is specially mentioned as a punishment of her pride. This was the deepest humiliation for an oriental woman. [For a vivid description of the scenes of this chapter see Stanley's *Jewish Church*, Second Series, p. 89–98, Lect. 23 (Am. Ed.).—Tr.]

* כְּהִגָּלוֹת נִגְלוֹת. The explanation of this abnormal combination—according to Ew. § 240 *c*—is "that since according to the sense only the second form must be in the Inf. Abs., both now with slight change of form appear in the Inf. Const., because the whole sentence by reason of the Prep. כְּ follows the train of the Inf. Const." Maurer: נִגְלוֹת is Inf. Abs. (for נִגְלֹה, in order to make paronomasia with the preceding הִגָּלוֹת). Thenius and Olshausen (*Gr.* p. 600) explain נִגְלוֹת as error of copyist from the preceding word.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. It was not till David had taken Jerusalem from the Jebusites, made Zion his capital and secured it by his victories from Philistine attacks, and thus for a short time at least secured peace,

that he could proceed to the holy work that he completed in bringing the ark to Zion, and that was of great importance for the religious life of the nation. This act *had its root* in David's truly pious feeling, was the living *expression* of his gratitude to the Lord for His favor, and *aimed at* the elevation and concentration of the religious life of Israel. It needed a new *elevation*, since under Saul it had partly at least sunk down from the height to which Samuel had brought it, and fallen into a somewhat brutalized condition. The royal house itself, whose influence on the people was so great, had more and more lost living piety; the spirit of pride reigned in it, as Michal (who was herein very like her father) plainly shows here in her bearing towards David; it is a significant fact that in her father's house she has an idol-image. The religious-moral life of the nation fell of necessity into more and more thorough dissolution, the longer Saul's persecutions of David continued and the external unity established by Samuel was destroyed by the wars between Saul and David, and by partisan oppositions. When, now, David by establishing his theocratic kingdom over all Israel had restored the *external* (national and governmental) *unity*, he made an important step further, by the act recorded in this chapter, towards elevating and sanctifying the inner life of his people; he laid the deepest foundation for their *internal unity* by again concentrating their religious life on its centre and source, namely, the dwelling of God in the midst of His people, symbolically set forth in the ark. "In Saul's time it [the ark] had not been sought after" (1 Chr. xiii. 3); the centre of divine service that it indicated had been lost. Now David gathers the representatives of the whole nation around him, in order at the head of the nation solemnly to restore to the centre of the national life the long-vanished sanctuary, and to renew *the religious unifying* of the people, especially in regard to *divine service*, about the kernel and star of the innermost life. By the transference of the ark to Zion Jerusalem, representing the national and political unity, becomes now *the centre of religion and divine service* for the national life. The account in Chron. supplements our history in regard to the part taken by the priests, the divine service and the ordination of the sacred service before the ark (chs. xiii., xv., xvi.). With this was connected the restoration of the unity and arrangement of the priestly service and of the duties of divine service. This unity indeed does not yet reach a complete external representation. There continue to be *two* holy places; the ark remains apart from the old tabernacle, which abode with the altar of burnt-offering at *Gibeon*, where also the offerings still went on (1 Chr. xvi. 39; comp. 1 Kings iii. 4). There the high-priest *Zadok* officiates, the son of Ahitub, of the family of Eleazar, who performs the legal regular sacrificial service at the tabernacle (Lev. xvii. 3). But beside him we find a second high-priest in that *Abiathar* (of the family of Ithamar), who escaped from Nob to David (1 Sam. xxii. 20), had remained with him, and now resided with the sanctuary on Zion (comp. 1 Kings ii. 26); so the two are named together in xx. 25; 1 Chr. xviii. 16. This double high-priestship, which had arisen from the separation of the tabernacle and the ark, was the reason why David permitted this separation to continue, and did not remove the Mosaic tabernacle also to Mount Zion, since he could remove neither the one high-priest nor the other from his office. We see also two sacred tents, besides the old one at Gibeon a new one pitched by David over the ark. While the sacrificial service is still continued in Gibeon according to the Law (1 Chr. xvi. 40; comp. 1 Kings iii. 4), a sacred service is established by David at the ark also; *ibid.* ver. 37 sq.—But in spite of this still continuing external dualism, there was after the institution of the sacred service on Zion an *internal unity* (through the establishment of regular divine service) such as did not exist before. The *tent* which is pitched on Zion, is provisional, and points like the old tent, which in the march through the wilderness and in the time of the Judges was the symbol of a provisional arrangement, to a central sanctuary to be erected, the founding of which David has in mind, but cannot yet execute (ch. vii.). But in this provisional, personal state of the religious life which in its two principal seats is unified, purified and arranged, the sanctuary in Jerusalem steps into the central point of the religious consciousness both for David and for the whole people, while the sanctuary in Gibeon retires into the background, as is especially evident from the fact that the tabernacle is never mentioned in the Psalms. Comp. Hengst. *Gesch. d. R. Gottes* [Hist. of the kingdom of God] II., p. 122 sq.

2. The *significance* of this narrative (of the transference of the ark to Jerusalem and David's conduct therein) for the *apprehension and representation of the theocratic royal office* in his person, is first to be considered on the one side in relation to *God*, and on the other side in relation to the *people*. The content of his consciousness as king is simply this *one* thought of the *dependence* of his kingdom for its *dominion* on the royal rule and might of the *covenant-God*, whose *choice* and *command* has appointed him king over Israel (ver. 21), that he is the instrument by which God carries on His government of His people. From this point of view the bringing back of the ark is an act of *reverence* and *gratitude* to the Lord, whose *name*, symbolically set forth in this sanctuary, is honored and praised by David at the head of the whole people as the sum of all his revelations to them. But also by the establishment of this token of the *presence* of the Lord in the midst of His people and of His *royal dwelling and enthronement* in His *possession* on Mount Zion, which David has prepared for his own residence, the idea of the indivisible *unity* of the human kingship and the kingly rule of God in His people is brought out. There is enthroned the king of glory, Ps. xxiv. 7–10; the king's throne is the throne of God, Ps. xlv. 7 [6]; Jerusalem is the city of the Great King, Ps. xlviii. 3 [2]; Zion is Jehovah's dwelling, Ps. ix. 12 [11]; lxxiv. 2; lxxvi. 3 [2]; thence proceed all manifestations of God's royal might and glory, Ps. xx. 3 [2]; cx. 2.—But also in relation to the *people* David represents the theocratic kingship in the light of its ideal signification. He *assembles* the whole people about the sanctuary as the throne of Jehovah; he will make them a people truly *united* under the dominion of God, moving with their whole life around Je-

hovah as *centre*, showing their king-God the highest honor and *serving Him alone* (Ps. xxiv. 1–10). In contrast with every other oriental kingly office David shows in his conduct the *popular character* of the theocratic kingship. He does not soar at an unattainable and unapproachable distance and height above the people, but "makes himself one" with them, mingles immediately with them, is accessible to all, and does not scorn fellowship with the lowest and meanest, because he knows that in the presence of the Lord he is not *connected* but religious-morally on the *same level* with the whole people and every individual one of these (vers. 21, 22). David, as theocratic king, whose government is to be the organ and representative of Jehovah's rule over His people, is *conscious* that he is mediator between the Lord and His covenant-people, and *acts* accordingly: on the one hand he "*represents the whole people*" *before the Lord* and leads them to Him, at their head and in their stead brings burnt-offerings and thank-offerings, and appears *with them* "before the presence of the Lord" (ver. 21) to restore at the ark the legally ordained divine service—on the other hand he *represents the Lord before His people*, declaring His "name" to them, and praying and obtaining His "blessing" for them.—Herein, as appears most clearly in this history, David not only stands in closest connection with the bearers of the *prophetic* office, but we see in him also the *kingly* office in closest association with the *priestly*, while Saul, in opposition to both these offices, allowed his kingly rule to assume more and more an antitheocratic character. But still farther: as David, as representative and instrument of God's royal rule over the people of His possession [*peculiar* people = his private property—Tr.], *possesses the prophetic spirit*, whereby Jehovah's word designed for the people is on his tongue (xxiii. 2), so also, like Samuel representing the people before God, he combines in his person the *priestly* character with the *kingly* and the *prophetic*, and in this festival in his priestly dress and procedure brings out and represents the idea, that the *theocratic kingship*, as a representation of the people before the Lord is to be a *priest-kingship*. [As David is never said to have performed the distinctively priestly work of sacrifice (committing this, as Erdmann himself says in the Exposition, to the priests), and as the representation of the people before God, and mediation between them and Him is a general pious work, performed often by prophets and others (Abraham, Moses, Joshua, Samuel, Josiah, Nehemiah), it is not easy to see why on this ground alone a priestly character should be assigned to him. In one sense the whole people were priests (Ex. xix. 6), a great spiritual idea being thus guarded against the perverting tendencies of outward ritual, and so David was in the high spiritual sense a priest, as every Christian now is; but in the narrower sense an Israelitish priest made atonement for sin by blood, and none but sons of Aaron could perform this service, as now human priesthood is abolished, and the priestly work is done by Christ alone.—Tr.].—But also the *religious-moral character* and the *disposition* of the theocratic king is here set forth typically in the presence of the whole people; he precedes them in showing the Lord His due honor in word and deed; he shows himself to be the faithful and conscientious overseer, leader and arranger of the divine service; he shows himself to be deeply penetrated with the feeling that he owes his royal office solely to the free undeserved grace of the Lord, and exhibits a *deep humility*, wishing to be nothing but the servant of the Lord in fellowship with his servants and maids. [See Translator's note to Erdmann's exposition of ver. 22.—Tr.].—This *humble disposition* of David in the presence of his God forms the sharpest contrast to the *haughtiness and pride* of his wife Michal, "who knew nothing of the impulse of divine love" (Theodoret).

3. God's *blessing* is an outflow of His *name*; it can only be *mediately obtained* by man for man, when it is drawn from this eternal, inexhaustible source. The Lord dispenses His blessing to house and family, people and State, only on the condition that His *gracious presence* is desired and preserved (ver. 11), and honor given to His name in mind, word and deed, as here by David and all the people. When men devote their *heart* and all their life as a sacrifice to the Lord, and consecrate themselves to Him, in reward therefor He sends on them streams of blessing.

4. The following are the *references in the Psalms* to the important event of the *transference of the Ark*. Ps. xxiv. was no doubt composed by David to celebrate Jehovah's entrance into the sanctuary on Mount Zion, with direct reference to the incidents narrated in 2 Sam. vi. *Jehovah, the king of glory*, comes to make His dwelling on Mount Zion amid His people.

He is celebrated as the king of the whole world (vers. 1, 10); on this foundation of the majesty of the Creator and Lord of all things rests the view of His royal glory, the revelation of which is unfolded in and for Israel. The praise of Jehovah as the strong hero in war, the Lord of Sabaoth, points to David's Philistine wars (2 Sam. vi. 1, 15). The primeval doors, which are to lift themselves up that the king may hold his entry, are the gates of the old fortress of Zion. The exhortation to the doors to raise and widen themselves assumes that this is the first entrance of the ark, and excludes the view that the Psalm was composed on its return from war. While vers. 7–10 describe the arrival and solemn *entry* of "the King of glory" with the outward preparation for His worthy *reception* and for His entrance into the *place* prepared for him, vers. 1–6 refer to the *ascension* of the people to Mount Zion and to the *moral requirements* made of those who will be in truth *the people of God*, who desire and seek after Him. Only the pure in thought, word and deed are His people and may approach Him. With unholy mind and unclean hand Uzza seized the sacred vessel; to this (2 Sam. vi. 6 sq.) refer the words of the Ps. v. 3–6. The blessing of "Jehovah the God of salvation" (ver. 5) recalls 2 Sam. vi. 11, 18. The words: "the generation of them that *inquire* after Him and *seek* His face," form a contrast to 1 Chron. xiii. 3: "Let us bring up the ark of God; for in Saul's time we sought it not."—The history of the entry is here regarded according to its higher moral-religious significance for the people of the Lord. "It was needful at the very beginning of the new relation to establish its essential character and fix it in the people's consciousness, to

furnish a counter-weight or equipoise to the external pomp with which the ark was brought in; to point out that true (not simply external) fellowship with a God like this one, the lord of the whole earth, and a share in His blessings, is to be obtained only in the *one* way of true righteousness; to point to the serious nature of the demands made on the subjects, that results from the glory of the entering king" (Hengstenb. on Ps. xxiv.).

With reference to the establishment of the sanctuary on Mount Zion, and in essential harmony with the first didactic-ethical part of Ps. xxiv., David sang Ps. xv. also, as is clear from the question to the Lord in ver. 1: "Who may be guest in thy *tent*, who may dwell on thy holy *mountain?*" and from *the portraiture of the moral character of God's house-companions*, though we cannot establish with certainty particular references which Hitzig here finds to the history in 2 Sam. vi. 12 sq. (see Moll [Lange's *Bible-Work*] on Ps. xv.).

Whether Ps. lxviii. (as most ancient expositors, Stier and v. Hoffm. hold), especially vers. 16, 17 (Ew.), is to be referred to 2 Sam. vi., is doubtful; more probably it is connected with the return of the ark from the wars and victories whose termination is given in 2 Sam. xii. 31.

Ps. lxxviii. in vers. 56–72 presents the historical *pre-suppositions* of this fixing of the seat of the royal glory, which lie far back in the history of Israel's sin and defection from the Lord to strange gods. The Lord punished Israel for their apostasy by forsaking His dwelling in Shiloh, giving the sanctuary into the hands of enemies, *etc.* But the Lord again had mercy, and arose in His might to cast down the enemy; He chose Judah that He might in it on Zion establish His dominion and build high His sanctuary. From hence He ruled as the king of His people through His servant David whom he had chosen to feed His people, as once he fed the flock, whence He called him.

Ps. ci., "the Prince's psalm" or ruler's mirror (Luth.), was not indeed composed by David on the occasion of Uzza's misfortune and the deposition of the ark in the house of Obed-edom (Hammond, Ven., Dathe, Muntinghe, De W., Del.); for, from the connection of thought, the question: "When comest thou to me" (ver. 2)? cannot be referred to the words of 2 Sam. vi. 8: "how shall the ark of Jehovah come to me?" and the designation of Jerusalem (ver 8) as "the city of the Lord" does not suit, since Jerusalem was so called in consequence of the establishment of the ark on Zion, and an anticipation of this designation (Del.) is not supposable. But this appellation, the "*city* of the Lord," taken together with the repeated expression "within the *house*" and with the prominent mention of personal, domestic, social and national duties and virtues, favors the view that some time after this event, which was an epoch-making one for his and the nation's religious-moral life, David wrote this Psalm with reference to the blessings that he therein received from God and the obligations therein imposed on him. The "*city of Jehovah*," which has received this name and the honor involved in it through the Lord's choice of it as a dwelling-place, "is to set forth not only in its divine service [ritually], but also ethically the character of holiness" (Moll), Isa. xxxv. 8; lii. 1; Nah. ii. 1, as the king "within his *house*," which is founded and built on Mount Zion as the seat of the theocratic kingly dominion, himself *walks* in uprightness of heart, suffers no other house-companions but those who with him serve the Lord in righteousness (ver. 3), truth (ver. 4) and *humility* (ver. 5), and so conducts his *government*, that in the nation and land he looks on those only as his true servants and his companions in the kingdom of God who walk in the ways of faithfulness and honesty. Ewald: "We are introduced into the very core of all the great king's thought and effort at this time by Ps. ci., which cannot have been composed till at least after this removal of the sanctuary, when Jerusalem had already for some time been the 'city of Jehovah,' and according to its whole content probably falls in these first years. Here is freely poured forth a heavenly-clear stream of the purest kingly thoughts and purposes. . . . How David, having before wished to become a righteous king, faithful to the true God, was now in the 'city of Jehovah' much more joyfully and decidedly resolved to become one, comes out most beautifully from the words of this Song."

5. The establishment of the ark on Zion was the beginning of the reformation and reorganization of the divine service, which was raised by David from the disintegration and lawlessness into which it had fallen under Saul, to an artistically beautiful form. He organized the priests and Levites, dividing them into twenty-four classes for weekly service. With his own musical endowments was intimately connected his zealous care for the organization of the sacred music, to which, with the aid of the three great masters, Asaph, Heman and Jeduthun, he gave a new impulse, and for the culture and further development of which, along with the four thousand Levites who were charged with the execution of the sacred music, there was formed a select chorus out of the families of the three masters. And with this was connected the development of sacred poetry in psalm-composition, of which David himself was the creator.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 2. [HALL: The tumults of war afforded no opportunity of this service; only peace is a friend to religion; neither is peace ever our friend, but when it is a servant of piety.*—TR.] FR. ARNDT: Truly to be praised and felicitated is every land that is ruled by a pious king; there mercy and truth meet together, righteousness and peace kiss each other: and the proverb is proven

* [The following specimen of allegorizing on ver. 1 is given as a curiosity: "The thirty thousand chosen (elect) are shown by the number to have been perfected in faith, works and hope. For *three* refers to the Trinity, and thus denotes faith; *ten* refers to the Decalogue, and denotes works; *thousand*, the greatest of numbers, the perfect number, denotes the hope of eternal life, than which there is nothing higher. Therefore multiply three by ten, lest faith without works be dead. Likewise multiply thirty by a thousand, in order that faith, which works through love, may not hope for reward elsewhere than in heaven." This precious morsel is found in *Rabanus Maurus* (ninth century), and also in an anonymous work of the seventh century, printed with the works of *Eucherius*.—TR.]

true: As the king, so the people! But also to be felicitated is every king himself, who does not forget that over him there reigns a yet greater king, the King of all kings, to whose grace he owes his royal power, who alone secures him his throne, and who will one day bring him to account for what he does and what he leaves undone.

Vers. 3–7. STARKE: He who wishes to rejoice let him rejoice in the Lord.—[HALL: O happy Israel, that had a God to rejoice in, that had this occasion of rejoicing in their God, and an heart that embraced this occasion!—TR.]—As a burning coal kindles the next, so may the good example of pious rulers attract the subjects to follow them, 2 Cor. ix. 2.—Even that which is done with a good intention does not always please God, vii. 5; Lev. x. 1; Prov. xiv. 12.—OSIANDER: Even pious people err when they depart, though it be but a little, from the express word of God.—[HALL: God's businesses must be done after His own forms, which if we do with the best intentions alter, we presume.—WORDSWORTH: All religious reformations which are wrought by men are blemished with human infirmities.—TR.]—SCHLIER: How could such a festal joy, which knew nothing of holy fear, however well-meant, prove acceptable to God? It is not enough that we mean well, and have pious thoughts; we must also, in what we do, hold fast to God's word and commandment, and in all our joy in the Lord must not allow ourselves to forget that we have to do with a holy God.—DISSELHOFF: Where God sees one that wishes to flee to the shelter of His word, He so trains him up that he learns to bow unconditionally to the authority of that word, and no longer mingles God's word and man's word.—F. W. KRUMMACHER: This interruption of the bright jubilee-festival was for every one a new warning that God's kindness never goes alone, but always under the guidance of His holiness, . . . that we dangerously overstep the limits of becoming modesty whenever we mount up to the delusion that it depends on us to rescue the ark as soon as ever the car of the Church whereby it is borne appears, through the negligence and unfaithfulness of those who are appointed for its direction, to be rolling into the abyss.—O. v. GERLACH: Uzzah is a type of all those who with humanly good intentions, but in an unsanctified spirit, take it upon themselves to rescue the cause of God, which they think is in peril.

Ver. 9. OSIANDER: When many have sinned, God commonly punishes one or two of the leaders, in order that the others may remember their sin and beg forgiveness.—F. W. KRUMMACHER: Though the Lord may for a time change His countenance, yet with His own people He always means faithfulness, and after the storm always makes the sun come up again in his time. However painfully He may chastise, His word of promise always stands: Can a woman forget her child?" etc.

Ver. 11. FR. ARNDT: Where the sign of the Lord's presence, the means of grace, is, there the Lord's presence and gracious working is not wanting, and where this enters there is indeed blessing upon blessing, as in Obed-edom's house.—SCHLIER: What blessed people we then first become when we receive God's word into our houses, and let this word of God be our heart's joy and delight. The blessing of the Lord dwells where God's word dwells.

[Ver. 12. SCOTT: When pious men who have been betrayed into unwarrantable conduct have had time for self-examination, searching the Scriptures and prayer, they will discover and confess their mistakes, and be reduced to a better temper; they will justify God in His corrections; they will be convinced that safety and comfort consist, not in absenting themselves from His ordinances, or in declining dangerous services, but in attending to their duty in a proper spirit and manner; they will profit by their own errors. —TR.]

Ver. 14. DISSELHOFF: David was full of joy because he perceived that entire submission of heart to God's revealed will makes one truly free and blessed.—BERL. B.: The joy of a soul is unspeakably great, which finds again in itself the pure and holy God, whom before it feared to receive.—F. W. KRUMMACHER: David gave expression to that which swelled in his bosom, even in corresponding gestures and a rhythmical movement.—The idea of that which the world of to-day is wont to associate with the word dance, is here to be kept quite at a distance. Dancing was in Israel a form of divine service, in which often —as in the case of Miriam and her companions after the passage of the Red Sea—the highest and holiest inspiration found expression.—STARKE: It is accordingly a shameful misuse to justify voluptuous dancing by David's example.—S. SCHMID: What is undertaken in God's service must be done with all the heart and with all the powers, in order that everybody may see that one is in real earnest.—Ver. 15. SCHLIER: So we have here a popular festival, and indeed a right joyous popular festival full of festal jubilation, and the occasion of the festive joy is nothing else than the ark, the sanctuary of the Lord. The law of the Lord makes a whole people, with their king in the lead, joyous and jubilant.—How much do worldly festivals amount to, and how little do Christian festivals! what a jubilee in the one case, and how little true festal joy in the other!—Our fairest and most delightful popular festivals ought to be our Christian festivals.

Ver. 16. STARKE: Divine and heavenly things are to worldly hearts only folly; they cannot know them, for they are spiritually discerned, 1 Cor. ii. 14.—F. W. KRUMMACHER: Even at the present day, alas! there is still no lack of people like Michal. In the pure fire of the Spirit from on high these persons also see only a morbid fanaticism; in the most animated and vigorous expression of hallowed exaltation of soul, a hypocritical display. . . . The life from and in God remains a mystery to every one until through the Spirit of God Himself it is unsealed to his *experience*.

Ver. 20. [HENRY: We have no reason to think that this of which Michal accused him was true in fact; David no doubt observed decorum, and governed his zeal with discretion; but it is common for those that reproach religion thus to put false colors upon it, and lay it under the most odious characters.—TR.]—There is never wanting to pious enthusiasm the moment when

it again gives place to the accustomed quieter and more equable state of mind. David did not always come home in so exalted a frame as on that festal day. But lamentable is the case of him who does not at all understand the eagle-flight by which souls devoted to God, in times of especial visitations of grace, are carried up above all the enclosures of their wonted every-day life, and transported into a condition in which in feeling and word they "soar above the heights of earth."—BERL. BIB.: After the soul has lost all its own greatness and all the joy drawn from itself, it has no other joy or greatness than the joy and greatness of God. Men filled with mere carnal prudence cannot bear such a condition. They condemn it and depise those who are so happy in possessing it, yea they chide it still, as here Michal reproaches David and passes carnal sentence on that which is spiritual.

Ver. 21 sqq. DISSELHOFF: A heart that with all the forces of its being clings so closely, so joyously, to God's revelation, or rather grows into it, draws from it all nourishment and receives from it all light, such a heart bears as a precious fruit that unfeigned, immovable humility, whose heart-refreshing image this history sets before our eyes.—He who walks in such humility before God and men, his eye is not blinded by the sunlight of good days, his heart and head do not become dizzy on the heights of prosperity. He stands firm, whether God leads him into the gloomy valley, or a step higher, or upon the summit. But such humility is born only of absolute submission under God's law and testimony.—[SCOTT: We should esteem such reproaches honorable, and determine to become still more vile in the eyes of ungodly revilers, by abounding in those services which they despise.—ROBINSON: We are warned from the examples of ancient saints to expect opposition and contempt, as far as we discover any real fervor in the service of God. Nor should we wonder if on such an occasion "a man's foes be they of his own household."—TR.]—S. SCHMID: It is better to be exalted by God with the lowly than to be humbled by God with the proud. Matt. xxiii. 12. CRAMER: Honor with God should be more highly esteemed than honor with men. John xii. 43.

Ver. 23. FR. ARNDT: If we look back once more, we see: All are blessed of God, David, Obed-edom, the rejoicing people; Michal alone has remained unblessed. Her lack of blessing was the penalty and the curse of her pride.—[HALL: David came to *bless* his house (ver. 20); Michal brings a *curse* upon herself.—TR.]

[Chap. vi. RABANUS MAURUS: In this history we see humility approved, pride condemned and rashness punished.—TR.]

Chaps. vi. and vii. DISSELHOFF: The blessed secret of standing firm in days of exaltation and undisturbed quiet. Belonging to it are: 1) Humble, unconditional *subjection* to the testimony of God; 2) Faithful, genuine, zealous *work* for the honor of the Lord and of His kingdom; 3) Grateful *stillness* when the Lord rejects our work for Him, and wishes to work in our own hearts.

[Vers. 6, 7. *The fate of Uzzah:* 1) Its occasion—neglect of a known commandment of God (Num. vii. 9; ver. 13). 2) Its immediate cause—irreverence (Num. iv. 15). 3) Its general lessons for us; for example, even an apparently little thing may be a great sin; an action may seem necessary, and yet be wrong; good intentions do not excuse disobedience; we must not expect to help God's work by measures which God forbids.—TR.]

[Ver. 8. *A man displeased with God;* thinking himself wiser, more kind, more just than God. Really perhaps vexed that his grand solemnity was interrupted, his rejoicing people disappointed, his prestige damaged, his enemies encouraged. Often when men complain of Providence on "high moral" grounds, they are in fact mainly influenced by some secret personal feeling.—Now highly elated with spiritual pride, at once thankful and self-complacent, and presently dejected, irritated and disposed to give up altogether (ver. 9). When any promising religious enterprise of which *we* have had the lead is disastrously interrupted, we are tempted to find fault with Providence.—TR.]

[Ver. 10. *Obed-edom and the ark.* Israel had long slighted the ark; Uzzah had been slain for making too free with it; David had shrunk from it in mere superstitious fear and resentment; Obed-edom receives it gladly, deals with it in the prescribed way, and is rewarded by a rich blessing. So as to religion in general. Some neglect, and greatly lose; some profane, and are ruined; some misunderstand, and pervert into superstitious fear; but those who truly welcome and observe it according to its real nature are richly blessed themselves, and may by their example induce others to seek it likewise (ver. 12).—TR.]

[Ver. 12. The "city of David" now becoming the "city of Jehovah" (Ps. ci. 8). 1) How it had been conquered; 2) How it was consecrated; 3) How it was to be prospered.—*Worthy purposes of a God-fearing ruler.* King David's devout programme when now established as theocratic sovereign (Ps. ci.). 1) As to his personal character and conduct (Ps. ci. 2); 2) As to punishment and prevention of evil-doing (*Ib.*, vers. 3-5, 7, 8); 3) As to encouragement of good men (*Ib.*, ver. 6). (Comp. above, "Hist. and Theol.," No. 4, latter part.)—TR.]

[Vers. 12-18. Sermon on Ps. xxiv., as written for this occasion. Comp. Ps. xv. (See above, "Hist. and Theol.," No. 4.)—Ver. 20. He that had "blessed the people" (ver. 18) returns to "bless his household." Piety in public and in private—public worship and family worship.—A good man, after public religious duties, returns joyous, thankful and loving to his home—and meets scolding and ridicule.—Vers. 16, 20-22. Religious enthusiasm, and those who contemn and ridicule it.—Vers. 16-23. Sermon on the history of *Michal.* (Comp. Henry on this passage.)—TR.]

II. *The divine consecration of the Davidic kingdom by the promise of the imperishable kingly dominion of the Davidic house.*

CHAP. VII. 1–29.

1. David's purpose to build the Lord a house, and the divine promise that the Lord will build him a house. Vers. 1–16.

1 AND it came to pass, when the king sat in his house, and the Lord [Jehovah]
2 had given him rest[1] round about from all his enemies, That the king said unto Na-
than the prophet, See now, I dwell in an house of cedar, but [and] the ark of God
3 dwelleth within curtains [the curtain].[2] And Nathan said to the king, Go,[3] do all
4 that is in thine heart [All, *etc.*, go do], for the Lord [Jehovah] is with thee. And
it came to pass that night, that the word of the Lord [Jehovah] came unto Nathan,[4]
5 saying, Go and tell [say to] my servant, [*ins.* to] David, Thus saith the Lord [Je-
6 hovah], Shalt[5] thou build me a house for me to dwell in? Whereas [For] I have
not dwelt in *any* [a] house since the time that I brought up[6] the children of Israel
7 out of Egypt even to this day, but have walked[7] in a tent and in a tabernacle. In
all *the places*[8] wherein I have walked with all the children of Israel, spake I a word
with any of the tribes[9] of Israel, whom I commanded to feed my people Israel, say-
8 ing, Why build ye not me an house of cedar? Now, therefore, so [And now, thus]
shalt thou say unto my servant, [*ins.* to] David, Thus saith the Lord [Jehovah]
of hosts, I took[10] thee from the sheepcote [pasture], from following the sheep, to be
9 ruler over my people, over Israel; And I was with thee whithersoever thou went-
est, and have cut off all thine enemies out of thy sight [from before thee], and have

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. Sept. *κατεκληρονόμησε* "caused to possess," reading נִחֵל for נֵוּחַ.—TR.]

[2] [Ver. 2. Sept. "tent" (אֹהֶל), others *δέῤῥεως* "curtain of skins." Vulg. has the plural here, as in 1 Chron. xvii. 1. The difference is not important.—TR.]

[3] [Ver. 3. This word (לֵךְ) is wanting in a few MSS. and in Syr. and Ar.; it is of the nature of an expletive.—TR.]

[4] [Ver. 4. "Nathan the prophet" in Syr., Ar., and in 5 MSS., a natural *scriptio plena.*—TR.]

[5] [Ver. 5. Philippson: wilt thou [wishest thou to] build?; Cahen: is it thou that wishest? Sept. and Syr.: thou shalt not build. Chald. has: a house for my presence [Shekinah] to dwell in. We may render either "shall" or "will."—In the first clause some MSS. and EDD., and all the ancient VSS. except Chald. omit the second "to," probably to ease the construction (as in Eng. A. V.); so also in ver. 8.—TR.]

[6] [Ver. 6. Thenius, citing the ancient VSS. (especially Sept., Syr., Chald.), would read the Perf. הֶעֱלֵתִי instead of the Inf. הַעֲלֹתִי, and would then supply אֲשֶׁר; but the masoretic pointing is at least as suitable as that of the VSS., and these last may easily be a free translation of our text.—TR.]

[7] [Ver. 6. Lit.: "have been walking," "have been a perambulator."—TR.]

[8] [Ver. 7. So Sept., Vulg., Chald., Ew., Then., Philippson, Cahen. De Wette and Erdmann have less well "in the whole *time.*"—TR.]

[9] [Ver. 7. This reading is discussed in the exposition.—TR.]

[10] [Ver. 8. In this address to David (vers. 8–16) the sequence of verb-forms (in respect to time) presents some difficulty. The passage begins with a Perf. (past time), which is followed in regular sequence by Waw with Impfs. till we reach the last verb in ver. 9, where the form changes to Waw with Perf., followed by similar forms in apparently future sequence up to the Athnach in ver. 11; in the last clause of this verse we find Waw with Perf., where the time is present. The remaining portion (vers. 12-16) is clearly future. The difficulty concerns the rendering of the verbs in vers. 8-11. Here it is to be observed that the change of form in ver. 9 after the Athnach is somewhat strange if the past time is to be maintained, and on the other hand, for future time we should expect the Impf.; it seems better, therefore, to take it as present (as in ver. 11). But in ver. 10, 11 *a* the time is more naturally fixed as future by the Impfs. that there occur, and the introductory Waw with Perf. (וְשַׂמְתִּי) may be explained by supposing that the preceding עָשִׂיתִי "I make," extends into the future, so that according to the law of sequence it would be followed by Perfs. Thus, then, we should render in the past from 8 *b* to 9 *a*, make 9 *b* a transitional present, 10 and 11 *a* future, and 11 *b* present.—This is nearly the order of the Sept.; it varies only in 9 *b* where the Greek has the Aorist (so Vulg.). Philippson and *Bib.-Com.* render throughout in the past, except in 11 *b* where the former has, and the latter permits the present. So Böttcher, Then., Cahen. The rendering here given is nearly that of Eng. A. V. and Wellhausen.—According to the one view God has given His people rest, and will now make David a house; according to the other He has cut off David's enemies, and will give him rest and make him a house.—The past form in ver. 1 "had given him rest" is the strongest argument for a past rendering in ver. 11, and therefore throughout; but this is not conclusive, since the "rest" in the latter case may be completer than in the former.—TR.]

made thee a great[11] name like unto the name of the great men that are in the earth.
10 Moreover [And] I will appoint a place for my people Israel and will plant them,
that they may dwell in a place of their own [and they shall dwell in their own
place], and move no more [and no more be disturbed], neither shall the children
11 of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime, And as since the time that I
commanded judges to be over my people Israel,[12] [.] and have caused [And I will
cause] thee to rest from all thine enemies, also [and] the Lord [Jehovah] telleth
thee that he [Jehovah][13] will make thee an house.
12 And[14] [*om.* and] when [When] thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with
thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels,[15]
13 and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build an house for my name, and I will
stablish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father, and he shall be
14 my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men and with
15 the stripes of the children of men. But my mercy shall not depart[16] away from
16 him, as I took it from Saul whom I put away [*ins.* from] before thee. And thy
house and thy kingdom shall be established [stable] forever before thee;[17] thy
throne shall be established forever.

2. David's prayer as answer to this divine promise. Vers. 17–29.

17 According to all these words and according to all this vision, so did Nathan
18 speak unto David. Then went king David in [And king David went in] and sat
before the Lord [Jehovah], and he said, Who am I, O Lord God [O lord Jeho-
19 vah][18], and what is my house, that thou hast brought me hitherto? And this was
yet a small thing in thy sight, O Lord God [O lord Jehovah], but thou hast spoken
also of thy servant's house for a great while to come. And is this the manner of
20 man, O Lord God? [And this is the law of man,[19] O lord Jehovah]. And what
can [shall] David say more unto thee? for thou, Lord God [*om.* Lord God], know-
21 est thy servant [*ins.* lord Jehovah]. For thy word's[20] sake, and according to thine
own heart hast thou done all these great things, to make thy servant know *them.*
22 Wherefore thou art great, O Lord God [Jehovah God]; for there is none like thee,
neither is there any [and there is no] God beside thee, according to[21] all that we
23 have heard with our ears. And[22] what one nation in the earth is like thy people,
even [*om.* even] like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to himself, and
to make him a name, and to do for you [them] great things and terrible, for thy
land [*om.* for thy land, *ins.* to drive out] before thy people, which thou redeemedst

[11] [Ver. 9. The adj. is omitted in 1 Chr. xvii. 8, and in Sept., which is better.—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 11. The first clause of ver. 11 is now (as the connection requires) generally taken as the conclusion of ver. 10, with a full stop after "Israel" (but Philippson connects it with the following: "and since the time … I have caused thee, *etc.*"). Instead of וַהֲנִיחֹתִי לְךָ Ewald (followed by Wellh.) reads וה׳ לו "and I will cause them [Israel] to rest," on the ground that here (from ver. 10) it is Israel that is spoken of. This reading would remove the above-mentioned objection to the future rendering, but cannot be regarded as more than a conjecture, since in such a discourse the change of reference (as in the last clause of ver. 11) would not be strange.—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 11. The proper name "Jehovah" is here inserted probably for clearness.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 12. There is no connective in the text, but 1 Chr. xvii. 11 and Sept., prefix וְהָיָה "and it shall come to pass," which, according to Wellh., has here fallen out by reason of the preceding יהוה.—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 12. The divergences of the text of Chron. from ours are obvious. The former is briefer and simpler, and confines itself to the expression of the divine blessing, omitting (as unessential) the minatory clause in ver. 14.—Tr.]

[16] [Ver. 15. Instead of the Qal we find Hiph. "I will not remove" in 1 Chr. xvii. 13, Sept., Vulg., Syr., Ar., which form De Rossi thinks is supported by some MSS., which have 1 sing. Qal Impf. (אָסוּר); it is scarcely possible to decide between the two readings.—So in the latter clause of this verse Sept. has καθὼς ἀπέστησα ἀφ' ὧν ἀπέστησα ἐκ προσώπου μου "as I removed it from those whom I removed from before me," and Chron.: "as I took it from him that was before thee." Here from the connection the "thee" of the Heb. seems preferable to the "me" of Sept.; as between "Samuel" and "Chron." the general presumption is that the latter condenses and abbreviates an originally longer text. The "Saul" may be insertion for clearness of reference, and the difference in the two texts may be connected with the repetition of the verb הֲסִירֹתִי (which in Eng. A. V. is here given by the two words "took" and "put away"). It is perhaps better to suppose that the two editors (of "Samuel" and "Chron.") have wrought the original material each in his own way.—Tr.]

[17] [Ver. 16. Some MSS. and Sept. and Syr. read "before me," which is preferred by De Rossi.—Tr.]

[18] [Ver. 18. In Heb.: Adonai Jahveh. Where this combination occurs, the Masorites call the second name Elohim (instead of the ordinary Adonai); the Chald. has Jahveh Elohim, Syr. Lord God, Sept. κύριός μου κύριος and Vulg. *Dominus Deus*, whence Eng. A. V. Lord God.—Tr.]

[19] [Ver. 19. For discussion of the text of this clause see Exposition and Notes.—Tr.]

[20] [Ver. 21. It is to be noted that, whereas Sept. here has "for thy servant's sake" (as 1 Chr. xvii. 19), it omits this clause in the parallel passage in Chron.; this may point to a correction of the text by the Greek translators (Wellh. takes a similar view, holding the Sept. "according to thy heart thou hast done" to be taken from Chr.). The context seems to favor the reading in Chron.—Tr.]

[21] [Ver. 22. In some good MSS. and EDD. "in all," which is preferred by De Rossi.—Tr.]

[22] [Ver. 23. The text of this verse can hardly be satisfactorily restored, even after introducing the changes

24 to thee from Egypt, *from* the [*om.* from the] nations and their gods? For [And]
thou hast confirmed to thyself thy people Israel to be a people unto thee forever,
and thou, Lord [Jehovah], art become their God.
25 And now, O Lord [Jehovah] God, the word that thou hast spoken concerning
thy servant and concerning his house, establish *it* [*om.* it] forever, and do as thou
26 hast said. And let thy name be magnified forever, saying, The Lord [Jehovah]
of hosts is the [*om.* the] God over Israel; and let the house of thy servant David
27 be established before thee. For thou, O Lord [Jehovah] of hosts, God of Israel,
hast revealed to thy servant, saying, I will build thee an house; therefore hath thy
28 servant found in his heart to pray this prayer unto thee. And now, O Lord God,
[lord Jehovah], thou art that [*om.* that] God, and thy words be true [are[28] truth],
29 and thou hast promised [spoken] this goodness unto thy servant; Therefore [And]
now, let it please thee to bless the house of thy servant that it may continue forever
before thee; for thou, O Lord God [lord Jehovah], hast spoken *it*, and with thy
blessing let [shall] the house of thy servant be blessed forever.

suggested by the Chronicles-text (as given in the brackets). There seems to be a mingling of two forms of assertion, in one of which Israel is compared with a heathen nation and Jehovah with a false god, while in the other the comparison expresses only what Jehovah had done for Israel. To the first form, perhaps, belongs the Sept. phrase "what other nation," and the Plu. verb "went" in "Samuel," and to the second belong the phrases "for you," "for thy land," "redeemedst from Egypt." As regards the testimony of the ancient versions, the Vulg. renders our Heb. text (as Eng. A. V.), except that it has at the end "nation" instead of "nations" (because elohim has the Sing. suffix); the Chald. gives the Heb. paraphrastically: and who is as thy people, as Israel. a people one, chosen ... whom men sent from Jehovah went to redeem ... till they came to the land of thy presence which thou gavest to them," *etc.*; Syr. "on the earth aforetime" (לְאַרְצָךְ מִפָּנֶי); Sept. has "other nation" (instead of "one nation"), "as God led them" (הִלְּכוּ instead of הָלְכוּ), "to drive out (as in Chron.) ... nations and tents" (אֹהָלִים for אֱלֹהִים). Instead of "for you," Vulg. and Chald. have "for them;" our text here is defended by Böttcher and Erdmann, but even if such change of conception is possible for David, it is harsh and is perhaps better omitted in a translation.—See further in the Exposition.—Tr.]

[28] [Ver. 28. The fut. rendering is given by Sept., Syr., Vulg., but the Pres. is better (with Then. and Erdmann), because the whole clause is a declaration of what God is essentially. Philippson has less well: "and thy words will be (*werden*, 'become,') truth, since thou hast spoken."—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. *David's purpose to build the Lord a house*, and the *divine prohibition* with the *promise* that the Lord will build him a house. Vers. 1–16 (1 Chron. xvii).

Vers. 1–3. *David's resolution* to build the Lord a house is *approved by the prophet Nathan*. Comp. 1 Chron. xvii. 1, 2.

Ver. 1. **And when the king dwelt in his house** (comp. ver. 11). What follows occurred not only after David had built his royal palace, but also after he, having secured external quiet, had taken up his permanent abode therein. The starting-point of David's words in ver. 2 (like that of the narrative) is the "house" in which he dwelt. [Philippson: Abarbanel refers to Deut. xii. 9, 10 sq.,* supposing that David thought the condition there laid down to have now reached a fulfilment.—Tr.] — **And the Lord had given him rest round about from all his enemies.**—According to these words the following narrative cannot be put chronologically immediately after the Philistine war related in ch. v., which view the position of this section after ch. vi. might seem to favor. Decisive against this is the phrase: "*round about from all his enemies*," and ver. 9: "I have cut off all thy enemies before thee." The temporary quiet that David gained by that double victory over the Philistines he used to bring the ark to Zion; but he soon found himself involved in new wars begun by Israel's enemies *round about*, first by the Philistines, according to the narration in ch. viii. Not till he had crushed all Israel's pressing enemies could he wish to carry out his determination to build a house for the Lord. On account of its factual connection with the account of the ark the history of this determination is attached to ch. vi., the narrative throughout, indeed, not appearing to be strictly chronological, but bearing the impress of a grouping of the several sections according to certain principal points of view. (In chs. viii.–xii. the external wars, in xiii.–xx. the internal difficulties, and in xxi. sq. detached occurrences in David's life are brought together without chronological sequence.) But it is not to be assumed that "our narrative is to be put in the last part of David's life" (Then.), since, according to ver. 11, he had still other wars to carry on against the enemies of Israel, for which reason precisely, and because he had to be on his guard without, the peaceful work of temple-building could not be executed (as Solomon also expressly affirms, 1 Kings v. 17); and since the promise in ver. 12 refers to the seed, that *will* yet proceed from his body. The time of the words: "when the Lord had given him rest" (wanting in Chron.), is to be put after that of the wars in ch. viii., whereby David secured his throne against "enemies round about," without being able thus to exclude further wars; his resolution to build a temple can be referred only to a temporary rest after his first victorious contests against all his enemies.—[Comp. the language in xxii. 1 and Josh. xxiii. 1.—Tr.] — Ver. 2. David communicated this

* [To this Josephus perhaps alludes when he says (*Ant.* 7, 4, 4) that Moses predicted the building of the temple.—Tr.]

resolution to the prophet *Nathan*, who, according to this, stood in a confidential relation to him as counsellor, and this is confirmed not only by Nathan's reproof after the sin with Bathsheba, but also by the fact (xii. 25) that Solomon's education was committed to him, and he with David's approval anointed Solomon as successor to his father while the latter was still living (1 Kings i. 34). [On Nathan see Erdmann's Introduction and the Bible-Dictionaries.—TR.]—David states to Nathan as the ground of his resolution the *contrast* that he dwelt in a *palace of cedar*, while the *ark of God* stood *within the curtains*, that is, simply in a *tent* (vi. 15). The word here used (הַיְרִיעָה) means in Ex. xxvi. 2 sq. the inner cover composed of several curtains, that was spread over the board-structure of the tabernacle. The Plu. is used in Isa. liv. 2 as = "tent," and in Song of Songs i. 5; Jer. iv. 20 as = "tents." The "within" refers to the drapery formed by the curtains; Chron. has "*under* curtains." David's words express the pious, humble disposition in which his purpose was founded. The *utterance* of the purpose itself is not added to this statement of its *ground*, but is presupposed in *Nathan's approval* [ver. 3]. **All that is in thy heart**, that is, in this connection, what thou hast resolved on, comp. 1 Sam. xiv. 7; 2 Kings x. 30. **For the Lord is with thee**, where the preceding "do" is based on the Lord's leading, under which David, as theocratic king, stands. Nathan characterizes David's purpose as one well-pleasing to the Lord. J. H. Michaelis: "out of his own mind, not by divine revelation."

Vers. 4–16. *The divine revelation to Nathan for David and his house.*

a. Vers. 4–7. *Not David is to build the Lord a house.*—Ver. 4. **In that night**, following the day on which David held the above conversation with Nathan, **came the word of the Lord to Nathan.** Nothing is said here of a divine revelation through a *dream* (comp. Num. xii. 6; 1 Kings iii. 5), or through a *vision* and the *hearing of a voice* (comp. 1 Sam. iii. 5, 10, 15), but the *word of the Lord* is described as having come to Nathan by *night;* that is, it is related that he received a divine revelation *in the form and through the medium of the word*, he receiving its content with the inner ear of the Spirit as a divine decision respecting that which was stirring his heart. Comp. Isa. xxi. 10. By the conversation held with David during the day Nathan's soul with all its thoughts and feelings was concentrated on David's great and holy purpose; this was the psychological basis for *the divine inspiration* that forms the content of the following revelation, and not in inner contradiction with, but in distinction from his answer to David, informs him that the purposed temple-building is to be executed according to the Lord's will not by David, but by his seed.—Ver. 5. Nathan receives the divine revelation that he may officially impart it to David.—**Shouldest** [or, shalt] **thou build me a house to dwell in?**—The question has a negative significance = thou shouldest [shalt] not. Chron., interpreting the meaning, has: "not thou." Certainly Nathan's assent to David's thought that a house ought to be built for the Lord is not thereby set aside; but it is true that the opinion that *David himself* is to be the builder is corrected into this other, that this resolution is to be first carried out by his seed. Hengstenberg's interpretation, therefore, that David is to build the house not personally, but in his seed [*Christol., Eng. tr.* I. 126], is forced and in contradiction both with his word and with Solomon's interpretation (1 Kings viii. 15–21).—Ver. 6. The reason for the *no*. It is logically obvious that this reason must stand in some relation to the sense in which the "shalt thou?" is spoken. *Not thou* shalt build me a house, for: 1) "I have not dwelt in a house from the day when I brought up the children of Israel out of Egypt to this day." During this whole period, while the people had yet no secure, firm, unendangered dwelling-place, the symbol of the Lord's presence and dwelling amid His people could also have no permanent abode. **But I was a wanderer in tent and dwelling-place**, that is, as the people was in constant movement and unquiet, so my abode was of necessity a movable tent, wandering from place to place; the allusion is to the necessary frequent change of place of the sanctuary, first in the wilderness, and then during the unquiet movements hither and thither in the land itself (Gilgal, Shiloh, Nob, Gibeon). Comp. 1 Chron. xvii. 5: "and I was from tent to tent and from dwelling to dwelling." There is no sufficient ground for distinguishing "tent" and "dwelling" as tent-*frame* and tent-*cover* (Then.); rather the "dwelling" is to be taken with Keil as explicative: in a tent, which was my dwelling.—[The word *mishkan*, rendered in Eng. A. V. "tabernacle," sometimes means the whole structure built by Moses, as in Ex. xxxv. 11, where it includes the boards, the tent (*ohel*, the goatskin-curtain) and the covering (*mikseh*, the curtains of ram-skins and seal-skins). Elsewhere (as in Ex. xl. 18) it denotes the board-structure with the inner curtains of blue, purple and scarlet; and again it is used (Ex. xxvi. 6) apparently for the inner curtains alone. It seems clear that technically the *ohel* or tent signified the outer cloth of goat-skin, and the *mikseh* or covering the two protecting heavy cloths of ram-skin and seal skin, the *mishkan* proper denoting the rest of the structure; but it is not so probable that the technical distinction is introduced here; the interpretation of Keil seems better. Still, taking the somewhat different reading in Chron., we may suppose that each of the terms *ohel* and *mishkan* is put for the whole structure of which they formed a part, a variation of terms for the sake of filling out the conception, the former rather suggesting the wilderness, the latter the land of Canaan.—TR.]—Ver. 7. 2. To the statement that the Lord had hitherto *had no fixed dwelling*, but had dwelt only in a *movable tent*, is appended a *second*, that in all this time He had *never given command* to build Him a fixed abode.—**In all wherein I walked**, that is, in my whole walk, during the whole time that I walked among all the children of Israel. These words are to be taken not with the preceding (ver. 6), which form the adversative definition of the immediately preceding declaration, but with the following, and correspond in context with the statement of time in ver. 6: "from the day . . . to this day." The "walking" denotes

the self-witness of the divine presence, might and help in the whole historical development of Israel up to this time. **Spake I a word with any one of the tribes of Israel?**—Instead of "tribes" (שִׁבְטֵי) Chron. has "*judges*" (שֹׁפְטֵי), which is adopted by Ewald, Bertheau, Thenius, Bunsen, after ver. 11. But the "judges" are there mentioned in a totally different connection of thought; and if this were the original word, it would be impossible to explain the origination and general unquestioned acceptance of the difficult "tribes." The reading of the text "tribes" is to be retained with Maurer, Böttcher, Keil, Hengstenberg. Maurer correctly remarks: "those tribes are to be understood that before the time of David attained the supremacy, as Ephraim, Dan, Benjamin. Böttcher gives a complete list of the tribes that successively attained the headship through the Judges chosen from them. [Abarbanel (quoted by Philipps.) renders "sceptres" = "judges," but this is not admissible. On the text see "Text. and Gramm."—Tr.] The "feeding" (a figure derived from the *shepherd*, who goes before the flock, leads it to pasture and protects it) denotes the guidance and defence of the whole people, to which *one* tribe was called, and which it accomplished through the judge that represented it. The Chronicler had only the line of judges in mind; his alteration is a collateral text that serves very well to explain the main text. **Why build ye not me a house of cedar?***—That is, a permanent and costly sanctuary, worthy of my glory. Comp. 1 Kings viii. 16, where Solomon, with reference to these words, cites as the Lord's word: "I chose no city among all the *tribes* of Israel to build me a house." Ps. lxxviii. 67 is in like manner elucidatory of this passage; for there the choice of David as prince, and of Zion as the place of the sanctuary, is represented as if it were the choice of the tribe of Judah after the rejection of Ephraim. [*Synopsis Criticorum:* In this discourse of God some things are omitted that are afterwards represented as having been said here, as in 1 Kings viii. 16, 18, 25; 1 Chron. xxii. 8, 9; xxviii. 6; it is Scriptural usage not always to report the whole of a discourse, but sometimes to give a brief summary.—Tr.] Thus in vers. 6, 7, looking at the whole *past* of the people, *one side* of the reason for the "shalt thou?" in ver. 5 is given: From the beginning of the history till now a permanent dwelling for the Lord, instead of the moving tent, had *neither actually* existed (because not possible under the circumstances), nor been *divinely commanded.* [There is no reproof to David in this.—Tr.]

b. Vers. 8–11. *The other side* of the reason lies in the history of the Lord's dealings with David, which point to the fact that *the Lord will build David a house* before a house can be built to the Lord.—Ver. 8. The Lord's *first* manifestation of favor to him was *his elevation from the lowliness of the shepherd-life* to the office and dignity of prince over Israel. "From the sheepfold" (נָוֶה) see Ps. lxxviii. 70. [Better: "from the pasture." The word means "habitation," which in reference to flock means, not where they spend the night (which is, as Thenius says, גְּדֵרָה), but where they feed (see Isa. lxv. 10, where Eng. A. V. has improperly "fold"), and this suits the context of our passage.—Tr.] To this was added the continuous revelation of His gracious presence: Ver. 9.—**I was with thee in all thy going.**—These two facts, the elevation of David to be king and his constant attendance [by God] in all his walk, answer to the elevation of Israel to be his people, and the Lord's walking with them (vers. 6, 7). The wars hitherto waged form the *third* stadium: **I have cut off all thy enemies before thee.**—These wars, however, were the wars of the Lord, waged by Him as king of his people (1 Sam. xxv. 28). On this plane of the Lord's exhibition of power in wars and victories over enemies rises *the glory of the great name* that the Lord has made for him in the sight of the nations round about (comp. Psalm cxxxii. 17, 18; 1 Chr. xiv. 17).—Ver. 10. These gradually advancing manifestations of the Lord's favor to *David* look to the *well-being of the people of Israel:* 1) He thereby *prepared a place* for them [Erdmann renders: "I prepared a place," *etc.;* see "Text. and Gram."*—Tr.]; that is, by subduing their enemies made room for a safe, unendangered expansion in the promised land; 2) *Planted them*—that is, on the soil thus cleansed and made safe He established a firm, deep-rooted national life; 3) *They dwell in their [own] place*, their life-power unfolds itself within the limits secured them by the Lord; 4) *They shall no longer be affrighted* by restless enemies. In these words the discourse turns to the future of the people. The sense is: after all these manifestations of favor in the *past* up to this time, the Lord will for the *future* assure His people a position and an existence, wherein they shall no more experience the affliction and oppression that they suffered from godless nations. The "as beforetime" refers to the beginning of the people's history in *Egypt.* The words in ver. 11 from "and as since" to "Israel" belong with the "beforetime" as chronological datum, and depend on the "as" in ver. 10. **And from the time when I ordained Judges over my people Israel.**—That is, not merely *during* the period of the Judges, but on from the time when the judges began to lead the people, since the Prep. "from" [Eng. A. V.: "since"] gives only the *terminus a quo*, and consequently the period of the continuous oppression of the people by surrounding nations in the time after the judges *till now* is not excluded. This glance at the history of Israel's affliction and oppression from the beginning on answers to the glance at the Lord's presence and walk with them during their long period of wandering. All this the Lord has done to the people through His servant David (comp. Psalm lxxxix. 22–24). The usual connection of these words with the *following:* "and from the time that ..... have I caused thee to rest" (so still Hengst. *ubi sup.* [p. 130]) is untenable—because: 1) we thus have the impossible statement that God gave David rest from the beginning of the period of the Judges on, and 2) the period of the Judges was any thing but a time of quiet. **And**

* [*Bib. Comm.:* The cedar of Lebanon is a totally different tree from what we improperly call Virginia cedar (*Juniperus Virginiana*). It is a close-grained, light-colored, yellowish wood, with darker knots and veins.—Tr.]

* [The general sense is not changed by this slight difference of translation.—Tr.]

I give thee rest from all thy enemies.—The verb (Perf. with Waw consec.) is to be understood of the *future*, as is usual with this form when, as here, a future precedes. "In the quiet progress of the discourse the Future here passes over into quiet description" (Ges. § 126, 6). It is also here to be considered that the Perf. refers to Future in *asseverations* and *assurances*. To take the verb in a Perfect sense [= I have given rest], the narrative concerning the past in ver. 9 being thereby resumed (De Wette, Thenius [*Bible Commentary*, Philippson]), is inadmissible, because the discourse has already in the preceding words turned to the future, and such a retrogressive repetition, considering the rapid advance elsewhere in all these words, would be intolerable. David's present rest (ver. 1) was only a temporary one—for the hostile nations were ever seeking opportunity to assault Israel. Although David's wars and victories hitherto had so far firmly established Israel that the former times of "terror and distress" could not return, yet his reign was a constant war with the hostile nations around, in order to maintain the security that had been won, and to ward off the freshly inpressing enemies. To this continuing unquiet refers *the first promise* of the Lord to David: "I will give thee rest from all thy enemies." The Chron. has (ver. 10): "and I subdue all thy enemies, and tell it thee, and a house will the Lord build thee."* The *second declaration* is introduced by the words: "the Lord announces to thee" (not, has announced), "causes to be announced." Thereby the promise itself: **The Lord will build thee a house** is raised to its supereminent importance above all the preceding words. In it culminates the gradually rising line of the Lord's exhibitions of favor to David, and through him to the people. The "house" is the royal authority in Israel, which is assured and established for his family. According to these words (vers. 5–7 and 8–11) there are two principal grounds for the Lord's negative answer to David's determination to build him a house: 1) as the Lord could have no fixed dwelling-place amid His people, so long as they were wandering out of Canaan, and in Canaan were constantly disquieted by enemies and driven hither and thither, so also David's rule, in spite of victories over enemies, was still too much disquieted by external enemies that had to be fought, he being especially called thereby to secure to the people a settled permanent existence for the future. Hence now also the dwelling-place of the Lord amid His people can have no other form than that of the tent, the symbol of Israel's wandering, which was to be ended and quieted first by David's battles and victories. 2) David had indeed declared that he wished to perform something for the Lord in the building of a house, but this human plan should and could not reach fulfilment except and before the Lord had completed His manifestations of favor to David and carried out His plan, which looked to confirming the royal authority for his house and family forever, and thereby assuring the well-being of the people. What the Lord had hitherto done for David, and through him for Israel, was only the beginning of this confirmation of his kingdom; it was by its assured connection for all the future with David's posterity that the firm foundation was first laid, on which could be carried out the work of temple-building as the sign of the immovably founded kingdom of peace and of the theocracy that was to exhibit itself in undisturbed quiet in Israel. The meaning of the divine prohibition, therefore, is this: Thou canst not build me a house, for I must first build thee a house, before the building of a house for me is possible. This second principal ground is connected immediately with the first; for the promise could not be fulfilled, unless by the establishment of external peace the condition for the confirmation of David's house was given. The first ground is more precisely defined in 1 Chron. xxii. 7–13; xxviii. 3 sq. by the statement that David was not permitted to build the temple on account of his *wars:* "because thou art a man of war and hast shed blood." With this agrees Solomon's word to Hiram, 1 Kings v. 3: "My father could not build a house to the name of the Lord for the wars that were about him."*

c. Vers. 12–16. *The wider expansion and exacter definition of the promise:* "I will build thee a house." Ver. 12 starts from the end of David's life; *after his death* the promise will be fulfilled. **I will set up thy seed after thee.**—The "*set up*" (הֲקִמֹ) denotes not the "awakening" or bringing into existence, but the elevating the seed to royal rule and power. The "*seed*" is *not* the whole posterity, as is clear from the explanatory words in 1 Chron. xvii. 11: "thy seed that shall be of thy sons," nor merely a single individual, but a selection from the posterity, which will be appointed by God's favor to succeed David on the throne. **Which shall proceed** (come) **out of thy body.**—The seed here spoken of was still in the future when this promise was made to David. We are not, with Thenius, to change "will proceed" (יֵצֵא) to "has proceeded" (יָצָא), as if Solomon were then already born. **And I will establish his kingdom.**—On the *setting up* and elevation to the royal dignity follows its *confirmation* to David's posterity, which has been called to be bearer of the theocratical royal office. This promise was fulfilled in the first place in Solomon, who also expresses his consciousness of this fact in 1 Kings viii. 20; comp. 1 Kings ii. 12.—Ver. 13. **He**, this thy seed, **will build a house for my name.**—The *name* stands for God Himself, so far as He reveals Himself to His people as covenant-God and makes Himself known in His loftiness and holiness. "To build a house for *His name*" signifies therefore not simply "in His honor, or as a place to call on Him," but "to establish a fixed place, which should be the sign and pledge of His abode in Israel." To the shorter formula: "To the (or, for the) name of the Lord" (comp. 1 Kings viii. 17–20, 48; iii. 2; v. 17, 19; 1 Chron. xxii. 7, 19; xxviii. 3) answers the longer: "that my name may be there, my name shall be there" (1 Kings viii. 16, 29; comp. 2 Chron. vi. 5; 2 Kings xxiii. 27), or, "that my name may dwell there" (Deut. xii. 11; xiv. 23; xvi. 11; xxvi. 2; Neh. i. 9), or, "that

* [The sense is the same as in Samuel.—Tr.]

* [See the thought here well brought out in Keil on "Samuel," Eng tr. p. 344 sq.—Tr.]

I may put my name there" (1 Ki. ix. 3; 2 Ki. xxi. 7). **And I will stablish the throne of his kingdom forever.**—The royal dominion will not only be one established in David's house, but also one *enduring forever*, never to be severed from this house. It is not here the everlasting dominion of *one* king that is spoken of, but it is said: with the seed of David the kingdom shall remain *forever* (= everlastingly). The everlasting stay of the kingdom in the house of David is promised. Comp. ver. 25, where David so understands this divine promise. Comp. Ps. lxxxix. 30; lxxii. 5, 7, 17.—Ver. 14. **I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son.**—The *relation* of *fatherhood* and *sonship* will exist between the covenant-God of Israel and the seed of David. This denotes in the first place the relation of the most cordial mutual *love*, which attests its enduring character by *fidelity*, and demonstrates its existence towards the Lord by active *obedience*. But besides this *ethical* significance of the relation of David's seed as "son" to God as "its father" (indicated by the Prep. "to"), we must, from the connection, note 1) the *origin* or descent of the son from the father; the seed of David, entrusted with everlasting kingly dignity, has as such his origin in the will of God, owes his kingdom to the divine *choice* and *call*, comp. Ps. ii. 7; lxxxix. 27, 28. 2) In the designations "father and son" is indicated *community of* possession; the seed, as son, receives the dominion from the father as *heir*, and, as this dominion is an everlasting one, he will, as son and heir, reign *forever* in possession of the kingdom. The father's kingdom is an unlimited one, embracing the whole world; so in the idea of *sonship* there lies, along with *everlastingness*, the idea of *all-embracing world-dominion*, on which the son lawfully enters. Comp. Psalm lxxxix. 26–30; ii. 7–9. **Whom, if he commits iniquity**—that is, not hypothetically, "*in case* he sin," but actually, when he sins (as cannot fail to happen); the seed, David's posterity here spoken of is not exempted from the sin that clings to all men—**I will chasten with the rod of men and with the stripes of the children of men.***—That is, with such punishments as men suffer for their sins. David's seed will be free neither from sin nor from its human punishment. "Grace is not to release David and the Davidic line from this universal human lot, is not to be for them a charter to sin" (Hengst.). Comp. Baur: *Gesch. d. altt. Weissag.* [Hist. of O. T. Prophecy] I. 392 sq. Such chastisement will not be set aside by the cordial relation of David's seed as son to the Lord as father, but will rather follow David: The *father* will punish the *son* for his sins. The elevation of the latter to such glory above all the children of men is not to be a reason for making him an exception in respect to punishableness, but in this regard he will be equalled with all men before God's righteousness. Clericus, against the connection, explains the "rod of men" to mean: "moderate punishments, such as parents usually inflict." Wholly wrong is the rendering: "whom if any one offend, or, against whom if any one sin," comp. Pfeiffer, *Dubia Vexata*, V. 2, *l.* 84, p. 390; Russ, *De promissione Davidica soli Messiæ vindicata*, Jen., 1713. In Ps. lxxxix. 31–33 we have the further elucidation: "If his *sons* forsake my law and walk not in my judgments ..... I will visit them with the *rod* of their sin and with the *stripes* of their iniquity." Chron. omits this declaration in order to bring out the more strongly the following thought that the divine favor will, in spite of sin, remain with David's seed (Hengst. *ubi sup.* [p. 135]).—Ver. 15. **But my favor shall not depart from him.**—It is presupposed that in his sinning he remains faithful to the Lord, not departing from Him, and that the chastisement leads him to repentance (comp. 1 Chron. xxviii. 9; Psalm cxxxii. 12). This is clear from the following words: **as I took it from Saul whom I put away before thee.**—Comp. 1 Sam. xv. 23, 26, 28. "Before thee," before thy face; Saul and his kingdom had to disappear before David, who, with his kingdom took their place, and with whose seed the kingdom will remain forever in spite of the sins that shall be found in the individuals of his posterity, "his sons" (Ps. lxxxix. 31). "The contrast is that between the punishment of sin in individuals and the favor that remains permanently with the family, whereby the divine promise becomes an *unconditioned* one" (Hengst.).—Ver. 16. **And thy house and thy kingdom shall be permanent**, as the result of the *permanent* favor and grace assured to David's seed (comp. Ps. lxxxix. 29, 38; Isa. lv. 3 ["*sure* mercies of David," same word as is here rendered "established" in Eng. A. V.—Tr.]), and as the lasting fulfilment of the promise in verse 12: "I will raise up, lift up thy seed." The word "before *thee*" is arbitrarily changed by Sept. and Syr. into "before *me*." Böttcher explains: "in thy conception" (comparing vii. 26, 29; 1 Kings viii. 50), and adds: "the reference is to the outlook of the living, not to a conscious participation still granted to the dead." O. v. Gerlach: "David, as ancestor and beginner of the line of kings, is conceived of as he who passes all his successors before him in vision." **Thy throne will be firm forever.**—This answers to the words in ver. 12: "and I will confirm his kingdom," as the continuous effect of this promise. In the "*forever*" (here twice given and resumed from ver. 13) in the promise of the *everlasting* kingdom connected with the house of David, the prophecy *culminates*. On the "*firm*" [נָכוֹן, Eng. A. V.: "established," different from the word so rendered in the former part of this verse, which = "sure," "faithful."—Tr.], comp. Mic. iv. 1, and on the "*forever*" comp. Ps. lxxii. 17; lxxxix. 37; xlv. 7; cx. 4; cxxxii. 11, 12. Comp. Jno. xii. 34.

2. *David's prayer.*—Vers. 17–29.

Ver. 17. Conclusion of the preceding section and introduction to the following. **According to all these words and according to all this vision.**—The *words*, as the *content* of God's revelation to Nathan, are distinguished from the *vision* as indication of its *form* and *mode*. To suppose a *dream* here (Thenius) because the revela-

* The Rel. sentence begun with אֲשֶׁר is broken off, the Inf. (בְּהַעֲוֹתוֹ), as indication of *cause*, acting as protasis and the Perf. with Waw cons. as apodosis in a future sense, giving the result of the sinning. Ges. §126, 6 *d*, Rem. 1. Then. strikes out the second ו (as a mis-copy of the first), and connects the Rel. with the suffix in הֹכַחְתִּיו.

tion occurred at *night* (ver. 4) is inadmissible—since nothing is said of a dream; for the *vision* (חָזוֹן = חִזָּיוֹן) is every where distinguished from the revelation by dream (Keil); and in Isa. xxix. 7 the word "dream" is expressly added in order to indicate a "vision" that occurred in a dream. Our word signifies the view, vision, as the result of the looking or gazing of the prophets (who are called חֹזִים, gazers, seers) with the inner sense, whether in a waking state or in a dream. In the former case the "vision" may denote either collectively a number of divine revelations, taken as a whole (so Isa. i. 1; Obad. 1; Nah. i. 1), or, a single revelation, as here (so Ezek. vii. 26; Dan. viii. 1, 2, 15, 17). But it is not the vision or view in itself that forms the essence and substance of the prophetic revelation, but rather the "word" or the "words" of the Lord, which as medium of the Spirit of God come to the prophetic spirit; the vision is the psychical form under which the revelation takes place. David's *answer* to the Lord falls into *three parts: Thanks* for the exceeding abundant favor shown *him* and his house *now* in *this* revelation (vers. 18–21), *Praise* to the Lord for the great things He has done for His *people* in the *past* (vers. 22–24), and *Prayer* for the fulfilment of the promise in the *future* (vers. 25–29).

a. Vers. 18–21. *David's thanksgiving for the Lord's gracious manifestation in the great promise now received.*—The words "David went in ... before Jehovah" indicate the powerful impression that Nathan's communication made on David's soul; the divine revelation received compels him to betake himself to the sanctuary "into the presence" of the Lord, where he "*remained*" (וַיֵּשֶׁב tarried [Eng. A. V. sat]) sunk in *contemplation and prayer*. It cannot be inferred from Ex. xvii. 12 that David is to be thought of here as *sitting;* for Moses there sat from weariness after long prayer. The verb (יָשַׁב usually "sit") is often used in the general sense: "remain, tarry." [*Bib. Comm.* correctly points out that, even if the verb be rendered "sat," it is not necessary to suppose that David prayed sitting. He may have risen to pray after meditation. Yet sitting under such circumstances would be a respectful attitude, and elsewhere we have no proof in the Scriptures of a customary attitude in prayer; that Solomon (1 Kings viii. 22) and Ezra and the Levites (Neh. viii. 4; ix. 4) stood was due to the peculiar circumstances. It is not stated in what place David offered his prayer; it may have been in his own house or in some part of the tabernacle.*—Tr.]—The *content* of this thanksgiving-prayer is like a clear glass, wherein we see into the innermost depths of David's heart. His soul, wholly taken up with the divine revelation and promise, expresses itself in the following utterances, which follow one another quickly in accordance with the internal excitement of feeling: 1) The *humble confession* of unworthiness in respect to all manifestations of favor hitherto made to *him* and his *house*. **Who am I, Lord Jehovah, and what is my house?**—The words answer exactly to Jacob's words in Gen. xxxii. 10 as the expression of the deepest humility and feeling of nothingness over against the greatness and glory of God. So in Ps. viii. 5; cxliv. 3 there is the contrast between the divine loftiness and human lowliness and nothingness. **That thou hast brought me hitherto.**—David reviews all the past *leadings* of God's grace, in respect to which, as manifestations of the divine favor and love, he so feels his unworthiness and nothingness, and at the same time indirectly declares that he has hitherto *submitted himself* to the Lord's *guidance*. 2) David, with like humility, thanks the Lord for this present *supereminent manifestation of His favor in the promise relating to the future of his house.*—Ver. 19. He gives the liveliest expression to his humble and *joyfully* excited feeling of the greatness and glory of God in the *repetition* of the preceding address, "Lord Jehovah" (ver. 18), and (*comparing* the abundant fullness of grace in this *present* revelation with the *former* exhibitions of grace, which culminate in it) in the first sentence of this verse (from the beginning to "great while to come"). **From the far future** [Eng. A. V.: "for a great while to come"], that is, of my house; the promise refers to favors in the *far future* for his house. The sense is: if, looking at former undeserved favors, I must bow low with the feeling of unworthiness, much more in view of the promises made out of free grace to my house for the far future. The last sentence of this verse (וְזֹאת תּוֹרַת הָאָדָם) is as enigmatic as the parallel passage, 1 Chron. xvii. 17 (וּרְאִיתַנִי כְּתוֹר הָאָדָם הַמַּעֲלָה). At the outset it must be assumed as certain that this word *torah* [Eng. A. V.: *manner*] never = "manner, custom, mode of acting" (מִשְׁפָּט, חֹק). Therefore the explanation (in itself very agreeable and easy): "and this (hast thou spoken) after the manner of men, thou actest with me, that stand so infinitely below thee, in *human manner*,—that is, in such friendly manner as men use with one another" (Grotius, Gesenius, Winer, Maurer, Thenius, and De Wette: "such is the manner of men") is as untenable as Luther's translation: "this is the manner of a man who is God the Lord," which besides rests on the conception of this passage as directly Messianic (pointing to the incarnation of God in Christ), and incorrectly takes "Lord Jehovah," which here as before and after is an address, as explanatory apposition to "man." For the same reason the explanation of Clericus and others is to be rejected: "in human fashion—that is, thou hast cared for me and my family as men do for their children and grandchildren, looking out for their future," especially as it assigns to David's words the very trivial thought of caring for a family for the future. Ebrard (Herz. VI. 609) characterizes this expression, "the law of man, of the Lord Jehovah," as a word of "presageful bewilderment," and finds the explanation in 1 Chron. xvii. 17, where he renders: "Thou hast looked on me like the form of man, who is God, Jehovah above;" David, says Ebrard, saw that he himself was contemplated, but at the same time so that Jehovah appeared to him here as a man, who was also God and enthroned on high, recognizing the fact that the final point of the promised posterity was Jehovah Himself, but Jehovah as man and God.

* [On David's posture see notes of Patrick and Gill *in loco*.—Tr.]

So already S. Schmidt, who (after Chron.) inserts "as" before *torah*, taking this last = "condition, state" (תור): "O Jehovah God, Thou hast looked on me ..... Thou who, in the humble condition and infirm state of wretched, afflicted man, art in all things made like man." Apart from the incorrect, direct Messianic interpretation, all these and similar expositions take *torah* in a sense that it never has. It means regularly *law*. Hence Dathe and Schultz render: "such is a *law* for men"—that is, so should my enemies act when they think to hurl my descendants from the throne. So Bunsen: "This (Thy promise) is an indication (law) for men—that is, Thou wilt make Thy will authoritative even among men." But this explanation requires too much to be supplied in order that the words may be understood. The same thing is true of the rendering of Hengstenberg—which Keil adopts: "The law of man, the law that is to *regulate the conduct of men* (comp. the expression Lev. vi. 2 (9), the law of the burnt-offering; xiv. 2, the law of the leper; xii. 7, the law of the woman that has borne a child), is the law of love to one's neighbor, Levit. xix. 18; Mic. vi. 8; 'this,' namely, the Lord's conduct to him in his love and faithfulness, answers to the law by which men are to be governed in their conduct to one another; when God the Lord so graciously and lovingly condescends to act towards poor mortals according to this law that holds among men, it must fill us with adoring wonder. To this answers the parallel passage in Chron.: and thou sawest me (visitedst me, dealedst with me) after the law of man (תור = תורה), that is, the law of love to one's neighbor, thou height (!) Jehovah God." Against this view is to be remarked 1) that it requires too much to be understood in connection with "this" and "law," 2) that God's acting according to the law of love (given by Himself) cannot be thus represented as in contrast with His greatness and glory, as if He stood above the conduct that men (according to this law) are to follow, and should therefore be worthy of the greater admiration if He condescended to such conduct.—As *torah* originally signifies *teaching, instruction*, both divine (Job xxii. 22; Ps. xix. 8) and human (Prov. i. 8; iii. 1; iv. 2; vii. 2; xxviii. 7, 9), it is possible to render: "and this is a (divine) instruction for (poor, abject) man, to whom Thou so condescendest, O Lord God," or, to paraphrase with Bunsen: "Thou instructest me (makest disclosures to me) as one man another; so great is thy condescension." But this rendering, contrary to David's tone of feeling throughout this whole section, lays all the stress on a formal thing, namely, the fact that God condescends to speak to him, to make disclosures to him, while it must be the *content* of the Lord's words about the future of his house that moves him to humble thanksgiving and praise. Not the fact *that* the Lord condescends to him with His word of revelation (which He has often done before), but *what* He has now *spoken* to him is the cause of his humble thanksgiving.—For the explanation of this obscure passage it is further to be considered that these words, uttered abruptly and in lapidary style, are from the connection evidently to be taken 1) as the expression of a joyfully excited heart, and 2) as the exclamation of humble astonishment at the greatness and glory of the grace of God in the promise given to his house, in contrast with human lowliness, as is indicated by the word "man" over against the address "Lord Jehovah." The *content* of the promise to David's house for the future, to which David has just referred as the highest evidence of the divine favor, and to which the "this" must beyond doubt be referred, is the divine determination that the kingdom is to be one *proper to his house* and forever connected with it, and is thus to have an *everlasting* duration. This is the divine *torah* or prescription, which is to hold for a weak, insignificant man and his seed, for poor human creatures. In the exclamation "*this*," David looks in astonishment and adoration at the *glory* and the *everlastingness* (imperishableness) that is promised his house. This kingdom is indeed the kingdom of God Himself, and since it is promised his house forever, divine dignity and divine possession is thus for the farthest future ascribed to this house by that "*word of the Lord*;" the "Lord Jehovah," towards whom David already feels so humbled and lowly by reason of His former manifestations of love and favor, now condescends to attach His kingdom in Israel, His everlasting divine dominion forever to his house, to his posterity, that is, to insignificant children of men, *by such a law, which is contained in that word of promise.* Similarly O. v. Gerlach: "This is an expression of wondering admiration of the gracious condescension of God. Such a law Thou establishest for a man and his house, namely, that Thou promisest it everlasting duration." Comp. Bunsen: "Of so grand a promise hast Thou, O Eternal One, thought a mortal man worthy." [*Eng. A. V.*, adopting the interrogative form with negative force, apparently takes the meaning of this sentence to be: "it is not thus that men act towards one another, but Thy ways, O Lord, are above men's ways." Against this is that the word *torah* does not mean "manner" (so Erdmann above), and that the sentence thus stands in no relation as to sense with the parallel passage, 1 Chr. xvii. 17.—Other interpretations (see Poole's Synopsis) take אָדָם as the proper name *Adam*, and explain: "as Adam's posterity rule the world, so shall mine rule Israel," or: "as Thou madest a covenant with Adam and his posterity, so with me and mine;" but the proper name Adam occurs nowhere else in the Davidic period, and this interpretation does not suit the context, especially the sense of unworthiness expressed by David.—This word again is taken as = "a great man" (so *Bib.-Com.* and Abarbanel), or as = "a mean man," neither of which senses it can have by itself. We cannot therefore explain: "Thou dealest with me as is becoming (to deal with) a great man," or: "this is the law (or prerogative) of a great man, to found dynasties that are to last into the far future" (*Bib. Comm.*), which interpretations (though agreeing somewhat with 1 Chr. xvii. 17) do not accord with the humility that characterizes the whole passage. Chandler's rendering: "this is according to the constitution of men," namely, that the crown should be hereditary (God graciously making it hereditary in David's family), is somewhat far-fetched and unsuitable to David's line of thought. The early English com-

mentators generally interpret the passage as directly Messianic; but the context does not permit this.—If our text be retained, the sentence must be rendered: "and this is the law of man," that is, the promise given is the prescription made for the government of man, who, in comparison with God, is so low, so unworthy of such honor; and Dr. Erdmann's explanation is the most satisfactory. But regard must be had to 1 Chr. xvii. 17, in which it is evidently intended to give the same thought as is given here, and which, as it now stands, is to be rendered: "Thou regardest me according to the line of men on high." It is difficult to bring these two declarations into harmony. Moreover, the two texts have enough similarity and difference to suggest that one has been altered from the other, or that both are corruptions of the original text. The ancient versions give little or no aid in determining text or meaning; they mostly either render literally, or give paraphrases that cannot be gotten from the existing Hebrew, and that offer no fruitful suggestion. It is noticeable, however, that the Chald. in "Samuel" has: "and this is a vision of men," while the Sept. in "Chronicles" renders: "Thou regardedst me as a vision of man," and these translations favor the causative form of the verb in Chron. (Hiph. תַּרְאֵנִי), or else a reading רְאִי "vision" instead of תּוֹרָה or תּוֹר.—Ewald (after Chron.) reads the Samuel text: וְהִרְאִתַנִי בְּתוֹר הָאָדָם לְמַעְלָה "and Thou hast made me look on the line of men upwards," that is, into the future; and Wellhausen changes תּוֹרָה (and תּוֹר) into דּוֹרוֹת "Thou hast made me see generations."—Since none of the proposed amendments of the text are quite satisfactory (for it is not clear how our present text originated), we must be content to know the general idea of the passage (which does not essentially vary in the renderings of Erdmann, Ewald and Wellhausen), namely, that David here continues his humble acknowledgment of the divine favor.—Tr.]

Ver. 20. David here affirms 3) the *inexpressibleness* and *exceeding abundance* of the divine favor bestowed on him, and the consequent *impossibility* of setting forth in words the thankfulness that he feels in his heart. **And what shall David say more to thee?**—Language fails; silence is here the most eloquent thanks. **And thou knowest thy servant, Lord Jehovah.**—As in ver. 19 the exclamation "Lord Jehovah!" formed a sharp contrast to the "man," so it does here to "thy servant," answering to the humble consciousness of the endless distance between him and his God, with which, however, is connected the childlike consciousness of immediate cordial community with God: for, as he often elsewhere appeals to God, who knows the heart, for consolation and justification against man, so he does here in respect to his thankful *heart*, since he is sure of having the testimony of the *Omniscient* for him (see Ps. xl. 6, 10 [5, 9]).—Ver. 21. **For thy word's sake and after thy heart hast thou done all these great things to make them known to thy servant**; the concrete "great deeds"* is here meant, not the abstract "greatness," see Ps. lxxi. 21; cxlv. 3. The word "this" [Eng. A. V. "these"] shows that the great things here referred to are the splendid promises that the Lord announced through Nathan to Him, his servant. Looking, now, at all the great things that the Lord has done for him in this revelation, David declares 4) *the supernatural, superhuman eternal ground and origin* of these new great manifestations of favor (which exceed all preceding ones) in "*the word*" and in "*the heart*" of God, that is, in His free *gracious will*, which is independent of all human merit. *For Thy* **word's** *sake.* Chron. v. 19: "for thy *servant's* sake," that is, because Thou hast chosen and called me to be king of Israel. "For David does not boast before God that his own merit had gained him these things" (Cler.). According to this point of view "*the word*" is perhaps that word of *choice* and *destination* given in 1 Sam. xvi. 12 ("the Lord said, Arise, anoint him, for this is he"), as Hengst. supposes. It is possibly, however, the old prophecy concerning the Tribe of Judah in Gen. xlix. 10; "for that David recognized the connection between the promise given him through Nathan and the prophecy of Gen. xlix. 10, is shown by 1 Chr. xxviii. 4, where he represents his choice to be king as the result of the choice of Judah to be prince" (Keil). [It does not appear from this passage in Chron. that David means more than that the tribe of Judah had been now selected in his person as the royal tribe.—Tr.]. "*And according to thy heart*," that is, according to the love and grace by which thy heart is filled, from thy loving will.* Clericus: "From the spontaneous motion of thy mind, without external incitement." Comp. Ex. xxxiv. 6; Ps. ciii. 8. Over against "*God's heart*" as the *source* of the great favor received David sets *his heart* as filled with humble *thanks* therefor; but his *word* of thanks must stand dumb before the clear Yea and Amen and the earlier *words of promise* of God, the Yea and Amen of which is this exhibition of favor. In thus deriving it from God's faithfulness to His promise, and from His heart-love, he adds the positive thought to the negative "who am I?" of ver. 18, and so leads the conclusion of this thanksgiving back to its beginning. ["*To make thy servant know*," or, as in Chron. (v. 19) "to make known all (these) great things." God not only in His sovereign mercy determined great things for David, but further for his consolation and strengthening made them known to him through His prophet.—Tr.]

b. Vers. 22–24. *Praise of the Lord's greatness and incomparable glory as manifested by this highest exhibition of favor, in accord with the great deeds whereby in times of old He made Himself known to His people as their God.*—Ver. 22. **Therefore**, because Thou hast done so great things for me, on the ground of this experience of Thine abounding favor, **thou art great, Lord God**; comp. ver. 26: "and Thy *name* will be *great*," not: "*considered* great" (Luth.), nor: "*be* Thy name praised by me" (v. Gerl., Then.), but it is an assertion of greatness manifested objectively in facts. The *factual confession* "great is the Lord" (comp. Ps. xxxv. 27; xl. 17 (16) is precisely praise to God.

* This is the only meaning of גְּדוּלָּה (גְּדֻלָּה). [But see 1 Chr. xxix. 11; Esth. i. 4.—Tr.]

* [Note that the word "heart" in the usage of the O. T. means the whole inner nature, including intellect, affections and will.—Tr.]

—Now follows the *ground* for this praise of the Lord's greatness: **For there is none like thee**—this declares *God's incomparableness.* Comp. Ex. xv. 11 "who is like thee, *etc.?*" Deut. iii. 24. **And there is not a God beside thee,** declaration of God's *aloneness* and exclusiveness, comp. Deut. iv. 35; 1 Sam. ii. 2. **According to all that we have heard with our ears;*** David here passes from the *contemplation* of the greatness, incomparableness and soleness, wherein the Lord has declared Himself to him in the *present,* to the praise of God in the *review* of the great deeds whereby in the *past* He has revealed Himself to His people as such a God. "In Ps. xl. 6 David rises, just as here, from his personal experience to the whole line of God's glorious manifestations in the history of His people" (Hengst.).—Ver. 23. **And what nation is as thy people, as Israel any** [nation] **on earth?** The initial "and," according to the sense, gives the factual ground of what precedes. We cannot render: "*where* is, as Israel, a nation, *etc.*" (De W. [and Luther])†, nor "for *whose sake* God went, *etc.*", (Hengst.), but must translate: "what nation . . . whom God, *etc.*" *Elohim*‡ here stands with a plural verb—as often elsewhere where heathen idol-worship is referred to, as in Ex. xxxii. 4, 8, where *Elohim* is used of the golden calf ("these are thy gods, that brought thee out of Egypt"), comp. Deut. iv. 7; 1 Kings xii. 29, while, as name of the God of Israel, it has a singular verb or other complement—because the thought is here intended to be expressed that there is no nation but Israel that had been redeemed by its deity or its idols by such a deed as that by which the true God had redeemed Israel to be His people. It is therefore unnecessary to change the verb into the singular, reading "brought" (הוֹלִיךְ) [הוֹלְכוֹ] instead of "went" (הָלְכוּ). In consequence of God's great deeds Israel is a people *sole of its kind,* to *be compared* with *no other,* comp. Deut. iv. 7; xxxiii. 29. By His great deed, the deliverance out of Egypt, He has proved Himself to His people to be the only God, besides whom there is no God, and with whom no other is to be compared (Ex. xv. 11–13; Deut. iv. 34). **Whom God went** (put Himself in motion) **to purchase to himself** (redeem) **for a people**; the deliverance from Egypt was the suigeneric, incomparable deed of the incomparable, sole God, whereby He made Israel an independent nation and gained them out of all nations as His own possession. **And to make himself a name**; that deed of redemption is the factual historical proof that He is the true God, who has not His equal, and the God of Israel in the fulness of His might and of the revelation of His grace, and this fulness it is that makes His name. In this His name (whereby Israel only knows and names Him as the God that led them out of Egypt) He is contrasted with the vain idols of the heathen nations as the *one* true God (Josh. xxiv. 17; Judg. ii. 1, 12; vi. 13).—**And to do for you great things and terrible.** The "*for you*" refers not to "gods" (Elohim), but to "people;" but it is not necessary to change the text to "*for them*" (after the Vulgate), because, David's soul being filled and excited with the thought of his people, in the course of his prayer his words turn suddenly in increasing vividness from reference to the people naturally and immediately *to* the people itself, and "since also 1 Chr. xvii. has in its 'for thee' this easily explicable leap to an address to the thing spoken of" (Böttch.). [But the address to the people is much harder than the address to God, and it seems better to read "for them."—Tr.].—On the other hand, the "for thy land" gives no good sense without forcing, and Chron. has instead of this "to drive out" (ver. 21). It is therefore better (with the Sept. τοῦ ἐκβαλεῖν σε) to suppose a clerical error, and (taking לְגָרֵשׁ as the true text) to render: (namely) **that thou drovest out before thy people.**—The frightful, terrible things are the great deeds of the Lord in connection with the destruction of the heathen nations. On this idea comp. Ex. xv. 11; Deut. x. 21. The fundamental passage respecting the expulsion of foreign nations is Ex. xxiii. 27–33, where this verb "drive out" (גרשׁ) is repeatedly used. **Which thou redeemedst to thee from Egypt.**—This fundamental deed of the God of Israel is expressly mentioned in this parenthetical sentence, because the right of property that He thereby had in His people chosen out of the nations, necessarily led to His maintaining and defending them against the heathen nations, and the destruction of the Egyptians in this deed was the prelude to God's for Israel "great" but for the hostile Canaanites "terrible deeds," whereby He placed Israel in position to drive their enemies out of the land. **The heathen and their gods**; these words depend on the verb "drovest out." Keil (who retains the "for thy land," rejecting the alteration according to Chron.) takes these words as apposition to "from Egypt" and supplies the prep. "from" before them [so Eng. A. V. and Philippson.—Tr.].—But this construction is inadmissible, because the Plur. "nations" does not accord with the Sing. "Egypt." After the deliverance from Egypt David will celebrate the expulsion of the heathen from Canaan as a great deed of God. The Sing. suffix [Heb. "nations and *its* gods"] gives no sense after the Plu. noun; to take it *distributively,* as Keil does ("the gods of each of these heathen nations"), is too hard; we must therefore read the Plu. suffix "their gods."—Ver. 24. The result of God's mighty deeds stated in ver. 23. **And thou hast confirmed to thyself thy people Israel,** comp. ver. 10; it is God's act whereby in the conquered land the people were led to the firm establishment of their dwellings, their possessions, and their whole life. The thought does not go back to the time of Moses, but advances from the foregoing fact of the subjection and expulsion of "the heathen nations

* [This phrase probably refers to the oral tradition by which Israel's history was handed down from father to son.—Tr.]

† מִי is not = "where" (De W.), but is to be connected with גּוֹי אֶחָד (comp. Judg. xxi. 8; Deut. iii. 24). See Ew. § 325 *a*: "what one people, what people ever [whatever people] . . . ?"—אֲשֶׁר is to be connected with לִפְדּוֹת as accus. of the object. [On the text see "Text. and Grammat."—Tr.]

‡ [The Heb. word *elohim* is in form plural, but is the usual word for *God.*—Tr.]

and their gods" to the *establishment* of the people in Canaan. **To be a people to thee forever.** The *design* of God's gracious benefits was: 1) *Israel was to belong to Him alone as His property;** through God's mighty deeds the long-since executed *choice* of the people as His property is ever anew confirmed, and their *obligation*, to belong to and serve Him alone as people, ever repeated. 2) "For ever" they were to belong to Him as His people. This appointment of the *people* to be *everlasting* is remarkable; there shall never cease to be such a people of possession on the ground of such gracious manifestations and saving acts of the Lord. To this idea of the *everlasting continuance* of a people of God, (—"all nations are finally merged in this people, the divine Israel, the congregation of Jesus Christ," O. v. Gerlach), answers the promise of the *everlasting continuance of the throne* of David, which gave him occasion thus to praise God for His deeds, whereby He has established and prepared Israel for Himself as His people *forever*. **And thou, Lord, art become their God,** as Israel has become Thy people. This His relation to His people as their God has been established by all His revelations and deeds; for He has thereby testified that He is *their God* and given Himself to them as their own. The people on their part have contributed nothing thereto. The Lord's free grace in its great and glorious manifestation is the source and origin of this covenant-association, wherein God is His people's God and the people their God's people. [*Bib. Com.* here refers well to Gen. xvii. 7, 8; Ex. vi. 7.—Tr.]

c. Vers. 25–29. *David's prayer for the fulfilment of the promise*, attached to his thanksgiving for the *past*, his glance passing from the splendor of the present (to which the promise has led him) to the *future*.—Ver. 25. David here distinguishes between the two applications of the promise, to him personally and to his house: **that thou hast spoken concerning thy servant and concerning his house**; "establish it *forever*," as indeed it has promised the *everlasting continuance* of the house and of the kingdom. Let thy *word* become *deed*.—Ver. 26. Design or consequence of the fulfilment: **that thy name may become great forever.**—David has in eye, as the highest end of the fulfilment, not the honor of his house, not the glory of the people, but solely the honor of the Lord. **Saying, the Lord of Sabaoth is God over Israel,** that is, "the almighty God, who rules heaven and earth, is the defender and protector of Israel, His people; He attests Himself as their God by protecting the royal house on which depends Israel's welfare" (Hengst.). **And the house of thy servant David will be established before thee.**—The petition here assumes the form of confident hope. This expression of definite expectation by reason of its boldness needs basing on a sure foundation, as is done in ver. 27, where it returns to the form of confident petition. For this reason the initial particle in ver. 27 (כִּי) is to be rendered "*for*" (with Luth., Buns., De W., Hengst.) as giving the *ground* of what precedes, and not to be connected with the following "therefore": "*because* thou . . . *therefore* has" (Böttch., Then.). The former rendering accords with the liveliness of feeling with which David prays; the latter gives a construction too sluggish for his feeling. **For thou, Lord of Sabaoth, hast uncovered the ear of thy servant,** that is, hast revealed to him through thy word (comp. 1 Sam. ix. 15), saying, **a house will I build thee.**—David goes back to this fundamental promise, because in it are contained all the manifestations of favor that are promised to his family for the future. It is on the firm basis of this word, wherein the Lord acknowledged him and condescended to him, that David founded that confident petition: **Therefore has thy servant found his heart,** that is, found *courage* [Eng. A. V. "found in his heart"]. *Heart* = courage, Gen. xlii. 28; 1 Sam. xvii. 32; Ps. xl. 13 [12] and often elsewhere.—In ver. 28 and ver. 29 follows the *conclusion* and the *completion of the petition;* its ground on the *subjective* side of confidence and courage (which is exhibited in vers. 25, 26) having been given by appeal to the divine *promise* (ver. 27), the *content* (*not* yet expressed) of that which completes the petition, is based on the *truth* of the Lord's word [that is, he first (ver. 28) appeals to God's truth and then (ver. 29) sets forth his petition in final form.—Tr.]. **And now, Lord Jehovah, thou art God,* and thy words are truth,** not: "*may* thy words be truth," [nor, "will be truth."—Tr.]. The following words of the verse are to be taken as protasis (Thenius): **And thou spakest this goodness to thy servant,** wherein the content of the promises is briefly condensed and recapitulated.—Ver. 29. The "and now" resumes the "and now" of ver. 28: **And now begin** (not: let it please thee) **to bless** (Sept., Vulg.) **the house of thy servant that it may continue forever before thee**; the everlasting continuance of the house depends on the *blessing* of the Lord; the *beginning* in the blessing that secures the everlasting continuance is related to the "*forever*." [Erdmann here follows Thenius in rendering "begin" instead of "let it please thee" as Eng. A. V.; the Hebrew word properly means "to set one's self to do a thing with free determination of will," and the rendering of the Septuagint and Vulgate "begin" is only a very general one and not very correct. We cannot easily find a better rendering than that of Eng. A. V., which is the usual one; other possible translations are: "make up thy mind, set thyself to, take in hand."—Tr.] **For thou, Lord Jehovah, hast spoken**; these words represent the content of ver. 28 as the divine ground of the desired fulfil-

* [This is the phrase found in Ex. xix. 5 "ye shall be to me a possession or property" (Eng. A. V. "peculiar treasure"), in Dt. vii. 6 "a people of possession" (Eng. A. V. "Special people"), and in Mal. iii. 17 they shall be to me, in the day that I make, "a possession." The Hebrew word (סְגֻלָּה) is rendered by the Sept. περιούσιος and περιποίησις, which have thus passed into the N. T. in this sense of "property, possession," as Tit. ii. 14 "a peculiar people" = "a people that is God's property," and 1 Pet. ii. 9.—Tr.]

* הוּא here stands for the 2d person (as the 3d pers. pron. is often used for the verb "*to be*"): "Thou art God," comp. Ps. xliv. 5 [4]; Zeph. ii. 12; Ew. § 297 *b*. [The "that God" of Eng. A. V. is incorrect, and Dr. Erdmann's rendering is right; but it is not true that the 3 pers. pron. is ever used for the 2 pers. or for the substantive verb; the literal translation here is "thou art He (namely) God," the copula being omitted as often in Heb.—Tr.]

ment of the promise, since in them is given the *security* for the confident *hope* that is expressed in the concluding word: **And from [or, with] thy blessing will the house of thy servant be blessed forever.** Instead of "thou wilt bless," it reads: "from thy blessing" as the *source* of all blessings "will the house of thy servant" to which thou hast promised everlasting existence "be blessed forever," which is the condition of everlasting continuance. David's prayer is completed by the expression of confident hope, and goes over into prophecy. [This future rendering of the last clause gives a richer sense and one more appropriate in the connection (God has spoken and it *will* be so) than the optative form of Eng. A. V. So substantially 1 Chr. xvii. 27.—Tr.].

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. *Historically* the divine revelation and promise that came to David through Nathan, concerning the theocratic-messianic kingdom that was forever connected with his seed, *presupposes the previous development* of the idea of the theocratic kingdom. Comp. pp. 68 sqq., 136 sqq. [Hist. and Theol. to 1 Sam. viii.]. In this development (which advances from the general to the particular, from the promise of salvation for all nations to be realized through the *whole nation* descended from Abraham) the promise that assigns to the *house* and *family* of David the position of bearer and mediator of the Messianic blessing is based on the prophecy which, out of the seed of Abraham as represented by the twelve sons of Jacob and the corresponding tribes, designates the *tribe of Judah* as the bearer of a royal dominion that embraces and brings peace to all the nations of the earth (Gen. xlix. 10). "While up to this time the tribe only had been designated in which an imperishable dominion was to be established, and out of which at last the Saviour was to come, under David the designation of the *family* also was added" (Hengst. Christol. [Eng. tr., p. 123]). *The really existing theocratic kingdom,* as exhibited in David's government, approximated very nearly to the *ideal* significance of the kingdom over Israel; that is, to being God's dominion over His people through the human organ chosen by Him, who was in humility and obedience unconditionally to subject his own will to the divine will. On the basis of this fact the prophecy of a future seed of David, that should, in the possession of an everlasting royal dominion, stand in closest community with God as *His son,* could take shape, as here in Nathan's word. In contrast with the kingdom of *Saul,* which came into sharp opposition to the idea of the absolute divine dominion in Israel, and consequently into permanent conflict with the other theocratic institutions (the Prophetic office and the Priesthood), there appeared, through the rule of *David,* the man after God's own heart (1 Sam. xiii. 14), *on the one hand,* the idea of the theocracy, in such manner that David regarded himself only as the "servant of the Lord," and wished to be nothing but the humble, obedient instrument of the divine government over the people, and *on the other hand,* the royal office was elevated to the position of being the controlling and centralizing point of all the theocratic main elements of the national life. This, then, was the basis of the further development of the Messianic idea, the way for which was paved by Nathan's word to David, wherein the idea of the theocratic kingdom, which reached its highest point in David, was most intimately connected with David's royal house.

2. The *historical character* of Nathan's prophecy shows itself in the first place in its *factual occasion.* This lies in the *relative* contrast in the plans of *human* and *divine wisdom.* *David's plan,* after subduing his enemies, to build a temple to the Lord's honor in the midst of His people, together with Nathan's agreement thereto, corresponds thoroughly with the theocratic *disposition* of the two men, and with their recognition of the Lord's relation to His people as the people of His possession, and of the people's character as a priestly kingdom. But according to *God's thought,* the *right time* for this was not yet come; for the execution of this plan (which is *not in itself* rejected) the divine wisdom demands 1) that the present condition of the people should cease, for (despite David's victories) they were still surrounded by threatening heathen nations, had not found sure and permanent rest, and so God's sanctuary must still be a wandering tent; 2) that David's house and the kingdom therewith connected should be completely, forever and finally established as basis for the unfolding of the divine dominion [theocracy] over the people of Israel and the other nations, as this dominion was to be exhibited in God's enthroned dwelling in the permanent house [temple]. Nathan is made acquainted with these thoughts and ways of God's wisdom through a divine revelation, in consequence of which he now in his divine-prophetic word does not indeed *principially* [fundamentally or essentially] *reject* the plan to build a temple to the Lord, but still announces the Lord's will that the execution of this plan is to be reserved for the seed of David. The view that the prophet's restraining word declares that Jehovah needs in general no stately house (Diestel, *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.,* 1863, p. 559) finds no support in the text, which says nothing more in ver. 5 than that *David* should not build; and the assertion (*ubi sup.*) that the prohibition is in no way based on grounds derived from the special situation is obviously opposed to the statement of reasons in vers. 6–11, wherein Israel's wanderings are connected with the still continuing unrest and insecurity of David's time (the enemies being yet not definitively subdued), and the thought is clearly enough expressed that the temple cannot yet be built because quiet is still to be secured against enemies. There is, therefore, no ground for referring (Diestel) the prohibition of the temple-building to an ancient strict opinion [against such building]; nothing of this sort can be meant here, since the symbolical conception of God's dwelling in space amid His people in a *permanent temple* is no more opposed to the strict conception of the being [essence] of God than that of His dwelling in a *movable tent.* And so also there is no sufficient ground for assigning this prohibition to some one else than *Nathan,* to *Gad,* for example. Rather the section vers. 4–16 is in accord both with the historical situation that it presupposes and to which it refers, and with itself.—From another side the concrete* reference to Solomon's birth

* [That is, the specific reference, the idea being clothed in a person.—Tr.]

and the temple-building to be completed by him has been adduced against the purely historical character of the words of Nathan and David; it is affirmed to be clear—from this reference, and from a comparison between it and the ideal picture of the kingdom contained in the words, and by comparing the brief and very peculiar "last words of David," especially 2 Sam. xxiii. 5—that we have here a later post-Solomonic remodelling of the original promise, and that this original promise, which was of a more general form, was at a later time more distinctly stated according to events that had meantime occurred (G. Baur, *ubi sup.*, p. 394, 405). Against which, however, is to be remarked 1) that those *special* designations are by no means so concretely set forth; there is nothing but a *general* statement of the raising up of the seed after David and of a building of the temple by this seed; 2) Solomon's discourse in 1 Kings v. 5 presupposes that Nathan's words contained precisely this statement. Thenius also opposes this supposition of an *ex post facto* remodelling of these prophetic words, remarking (p. 176, 2d ed.): "For the rest there is no ground to suppose with De Wette that Nathan's prophecy was not composed till after Solomon; Ps. lxxxix. (vers. 4, 5, 20–38 [3, 4, 19–37], especially ver. 20 [19]), Ps. cxxxii. 11, 12, and Isa. lv. 3 attest its historical truth, and rightly understood it as Messianic also."—To this must be added that *David's prayer* (vers. 18–29) which in its peculiar individuality bears the marks of genuineness or originality, presupposes the whole content of Nathan's words as here reported, especially the reference to the future and to the everlasting continuance of David's house (comp. vers. 19, 25. 26, 27, 29); and so also his Ps. xviii. (ch. xxii.), especially the close, and his last word (xxiii. 1–7).

3. The *chief points in the content* of this prophecy, which is introduced by the word: "Not *thou* shalt build for *the Lord* a house, but *the Lord* will build *thee* a house," are the following (in order of mention): 1) **God promises** *David* a seed *destined and called to be the bearer of the theocratical kingdom.* It is true, the promise relates to David's *house* in general (vers. 11, 16, 19, 25, 26, 27, 29). But the house is not identical with the *seed*, to whom refer the declarations that form the gist of the prophecy. This seed is not the *whole* posterity, but a *selection* from it; comp. ver. 12: "I will raise up thy seed after thee" with 1 Chr. xvii. 11, according to which the seed is to be *of* the sons of David; nor is it restricted to a single person, but signifies *the posterity selected and appointed by God*, which is to be bearer for all future time of the theocratic kingdom. 2) For this *seed* chosen by God's free grace, wherein is represented the house that the Lord builds for David, *the kingdom is firmly established; the securely established royal authority will be attached to the house of David* (ver. 12). 3) To the *Davidic kingdom*, the bearer of which is David's seed, an *everlasting duration* is promised; the reference is not to the everlasting rule of a single king, but to the endless continuance of the kingdom of David's seed. Like the promised kingdom, the house of David also has a perpetual duration (vers. 13. 16). 4) God promises to be the *Father* of David's seed, and pledges it such an intimate relation to Himself that it shall be *His son.* As God is the *Father* of the *people* of Israel by the fact that He has *chosen* them as His people by free grace, *made* them His people by redemption, *led* them by His paternal love, *obligated* them to obedience, and *sanctified* them to be the people of His possession, so He is *the Father* of the everlasting royal *seed of David* by the fact that He has chosen it for *His* kingly house in Israel, and made and formed it to be bearer of His everlasting dominion over His people, and it is His *son* by love of most intimate fellowship with God, and by the humble obedience wherein it thoroughly subjects its will to the divine will. "As all Israelites are sons of Jehovah (Deut. xiv. 1), so must the king be in special measure, but only as the head of the chosen people of God" (Diestel, *ubi sup.* 559). 5) On the ground of this relation of father and son *the favor of God will abide unchanged* with the seed of David, that is, the theocratic king. He will, indeed, be punished for the *sins* into which he falls; but these chastisements will never reach the point of rejection, as happened in Saul's case; the sins of David's seed will, for the sake of the promise given to David, never set aside the divine counsel.—"The word of the prophet Nathan and the thanksgiving of David mark the culmination of the Davidic history" (Baumgarten).

4. *The significance of the prophecy for the Messianic expectation of salvation. The direct Messianic reference to Christ* (Tertull. *ad Marc.* iii. 20; Lactant. *divin. instit.* 4, 13; August. *de civ. Dei*, 17, 8; Rupert von Deutz, Beza, S. Schmid, Calov, Pfeiffer, Buddeus, and other old theologians [Patrick (in part), A. Clarke]) stands (apart from the unhistorical view of the nature of Messianic prophecy that lies at its foundation) in contradiction with the sinning of David's seed (vers. 14, 15), whereby a purely human and sinful posterity is designated, and with the temple-building (ver. 13), which can only be understood of earthly work. [Some attempt to set aside these objections to a direct Messianic interpretation by suggesting that the sin in the case of Christ is the sin He bore for men, as in Isa. liii. (Gill), or by rendering ver. 14 "even in his *suffering for iniquity* I shall chasten him," *etc.* (A. Clarke), and by regarding the house built by Christ as a spiritual one; but this translation of the Heb. is not admissible, and the spiritualizing in the other case is harsh and contrary to the plain meaning of the text. Such a prophecy must be treated as that of the "Servant of Jehovah" in Isaiah and as the Parable of the Prodigal Son; the main spiritual idea must be determined, and its fulfilment looked for in the Messiah, without attempting to transfer all the details into the sphere of permanent spiritual history.—Tr.]—The *limitation* of the prophecy to *Solomon* and his *immediate posterity* (Rabbinical writers, Grotius) is opposed to the "*everlasting*" duration that is promised the Davidic kingdom, and that cannot be weakened into a designation of a long period of time (comp. Ps. lxxxix. 30 [29]). [The phrase "forever" (the Eng. rendering of several different but substantially equivalent phrases in Heb.) sometimes indicates a limited period of time (as in 1 Sam. i. 22), where the limitation is determined by the nature of the case or by statements in the context; here the absence of any special limiting statements, taken in connection

with the general tone of the promises to Israel in the Old Test., leads us to the conclusion that an unlimited duration is intended to be expressed.—Tr.]—The interpretation that refers the words *in part* immediately and directly *to Christ, in part to Solomon* and his nearest posterity is found already in Theodoret (2 *Reg. quæst.* 21), who explains vers. 12. 13 a, 14 b, 15 of David's immediate bodily descendants, but vers. 13 b, 14 a, 16 of Christ. So also Brenz: "he does not wholly exclude Solomon, yet refers principally to Christ." Similarly Sack (*Apologet.* 243 sq.) says that the *seed* of vers. 12 and 13 is to be understood of the Messiah, but the content of vers. 14, 15 of the earlier scions of the Davidic house, from whom, notwithstanding their sins, the kingdom is never or at least not soon to be withdrawn. But this supposition of a double reference is as much opposed by the unity and continuity of the prophet's thoughts and views (as traced in the Exposition) as the related supposition (based on the presupposition of a double sense in the Scripture) according to which Nathan's word refers in the literal sense to Solomon, in the mystical sense to Christ (Glass, *philol. sacra*, p. 272). [We must distinguish between this mechanical view of a double sense in Scripture and the view that assigns to certain persons and things a *typical-prophetical* position in the development of the plan of salvation.—Tr.]

In the first place it must be determined in what respect we are to suppose a factual *fulfilment* of this promise *in David's own lifetime*, and then in his *posterity*. *David himself*, in 1 Chr. xxii. 9 sq., refers them first to *Solomon*, applying to him the words: "he will be to me a son and I will be to him a father, and I will establish the law of his kingdom over Israel for ever." David does the same in 1 Chr. xxviii. 2 sq., both times with the exhortation faithfully to observe the commandments and judgments of God, and by obedience to the Lord's will to live worthy of his high calling in order that the promise might be fulfilled. So also *Solomon* applies the promise to himself, 1 Kings v. 5; 2 Chr. vi. 7 sq.; 1 Kings viii. 17–20. In 1 Kings ix. 4, 5 God confirms to him the power given to David, assuring him that if he would walk before His face as David did, and faithfully keep His commandments, He would establish the throne of his dominion forever, in accordance with His promise to David: "there shalt not fail thee a man from the throne of Israel."—Punishment for his defection from the living God was visited on Solomon by the separation of the Ten Tribes under Jeroboam; but the promise that His favor should yet not be withdrawn from David's house is also fulfilled, the kingdom "for David's sake" and "that David, the servant of the Lord, might always have a light before him in Jerusalem, which He had chosen to put His name there," remaining to the seed of David, which for this sin "is to be afflicted, but not forever." The humbling of David's seed was to be only temporary, and the promise of the everlasting kingdom was to be fulfilled not in Jeroboam's house, but in David's, 1 Kings xi. 31–39. Abijah, the son of Rehoboam, walked in the sins *of his father*, and his heart was not wholly with the Lord; but for *David's* sake the Lord his God gave Rehoboam a light in Jerusalem, in that he raised up his son after him and let Jerusalem stand, because *David* had done what was right in the sight of the Lord (1 Kings xv. 4, 5). *Jehoram* did that which was evil in the eyes of the Lord; but the Lord would not destroy Judah for David his servant's sake, as He had promised to give him a light in his sons alway (2 Kings viii. 18, 19). "While prophecy announces the downfall of one dynasty after another of the Ten Tribes, it also indeed threatens *individual* apostate kings in Judah with the divine judgment, but never questions the continuance of the right of David's family to the throne. David's crown may be taken away; but there will come one to whom it belongs, Ezek. xxi. 32 [27]" (Œhler, *Herz.* IX. 412). The promise is thus referred to all David's descendants that were called to the throne from Solomon on (comp. Ps. lxxxix. 20–50; cxxxii. 10, 11) in accordance with the word of David in 2 Sam. vii. 25, wherein he speaks of the promise of an everlasting kingdom as one that is given forever to his *house*.—Nathan's prophecy has thus in the first place a *fundamental significance* for the development of the kingdom of God and the salvation therein unfolded, in so far as from now on for all time the *kingdom of Israel* with its theocratic calling to realize God's dominion in the life of His people, and to fulfil the ends of His kingdom, towers far above the Prophetic Office (as the organ of the revelation and announcement of God's will to His people), and above the High-priesthood (as expiatory mediation between the sinful people and the holy God). *All hopes and expectations of the future salvation* under the theocracy that is realizing itself in the people attach themselves to *the idea of the theocratic kingdom*, which is the representative and manifestation of the kingdom of God itself and therefore everlasting, as also the people of God themselves have received the promise of everlasting duration (Deut. xi. 21). But this kingdom is exclusively the *Davidic;* with the seed of David (so far as this seed is chosen and appointed for it) it goes forth as everlasting bearer of the favors and blessings of God, of which the people partake on the ground of the covenant that God has concluded with David (Isa. lv. 3). "Things may indeed be affirmed of every king that sits on David's throne that are true in the first instance not of him personally, but of the kingdom that he represents (comp. passages like Ps. xxi. 5, 7; lxi. 7). But, impelled by the Spirit, the sacred poesy produces a kingly form that far transcends what the present shows, and exhibits the Davidic and Solomonic kingdom in its archetypal completeness" (Oehler, *Herz.* IX. 412). The *idea* of the theocratic Davidic kingdom of *everlasting* duration, and with the stamp of sonship assumes from this prophecy a concrete form in the *ideal* of a theocratic king who proceeds from the seed of David. This latter is called in Ps. ii. 7, 12, "the son of God" absolutely; in Ps. cx. 1 declared to be the ruler that shares with God His *unlimited* might and power over heaven and earth, and even David's lord; in Ps. lxxii. *everlasting* dominion to the ends of the earth is ascribed to him, and in Ps. xlv. 2 the name "Elohim, God," itself is given him. In David's prophetic word in 2 Sam. xxiii. this ideal takes the form of a *righteous* ruler, who introduces a glorious future, in Ps. ii., cx., that

of a *victorious* prince who as son and heir of God in unconquerable power extends his dominion by vigorous battles over the whole earth, and brings His foes to his feet, and in Ps. lxxii. that of a *powerful* prince, who conducts His government in divine righteousness, dispenses weal and blessing to the wretched, stretches out His kingdom of peace and its blessings over all princes and nations of the earth and receives their homage.—[More correctly, these passages refer first to a present earthly monarch *looked on as representing the ideal king*, and their assertions, partially true of the finite earthly king, are to be realized in one that shall be identical with the ideal.—Tr.] Further the promise given to David is the foundation of all Messianic prophecies and hopes in the prophets concerning the completion of the kingdom of God, its revelations of grace and its blessings of salvation, comp. Oehler *ubi sup.* 413. The idea of the everlasting victorious and peaceful theocracy that embraces not only Israel, but all the nations of the earth, and the ideal of the theocratic king, proceeding from David's house and seed, and standing in the exclusive relation to God of son, who introduces and exercises this dominion [the theocracy], finds its full reality in the Messiah, Jesus Christ, the *Son of God* and *Son of David*, who is anointed without measure with the Holy Ghost and by the complete indwelling of God in His person exhibits Himself as the personal principle of the kingdom of God. The view that the descent of Christ from the Davidic race does *not* belong to the essential content of the fulfilment of the idea of the Old Testament-kingdom (G. Baur, 407) is refuted by the constant declarations of the prophets concerning the Davidic descent of the great king, as well as by the universal Jewish conception of the Messiah as the son of David (Matt. xxii. 42 sq.), both of which rest on this *fundamental prophecy*. Jesus Himself accepts the name of "Son of David" without protest; Paul (Rom. i. 3), the Epistle to the Hebrews (vii. 14), and the Apocalypse (v. 5; xxii. 16) declare Him to be a descendant of David. "How deep this promise penetrated David's soul is shown by his thanksgiving prayer in 2 Sam. vii. 18 sq. The Messiah is not therein spoken of in the first instance; it relates to the ideal person of the Davidic race; but its final fulfilment in the Messiah is already contained indirectly in its own content, since the *everlastingness* of a merely human kingdom is inconceivable; this became clearer to David the more he compared this promise with the Messianic idea that had come down from the fathers; it finally reached full certainty in his mind through the further inward disclosures that attached themselves to this fundamental promise which occupied David day and night" (Hengst., *Gesch. d. Reich. Gott. unter d. Alt. Bundes*, 1871, II. 2, 124 [Hengstenberg's *Hist. of the Kingdom of God under the Old Covenant*]).

5. *The prayer of David* after the reception of the Lord's promise of favor (vers. 18–29) bears testimony to the unexpected, joyfully surprising revelation that was made to him, and mirrors his childlike *humility, fervid devotion* and *unshakable confidence* towards his God. To this prayer which proceeds from a joyfully shocked and deeply moved heart, applies (so far as is possible from the Old Testament stand-point) what Bernard of Clairvaux says of true prayer: "If the way to God's throne is to stand free and open to our prayer, and it is there to find ready acceptance and hearing, it must proceed from an *humble, fervid* and *trusting* heart. *Humility* teaches us the necessity of prayer, *fervor* gives it flight and endurance, *trust* provides it with an unmovable foundation." The humility of the praying servant of God expresses itself in the declaration of its own littleness and unworthiness: 1) in view of the many manifestations of favor, through which the Lord has brought him in the *past* up to this point (ver. 18); 2) In view of the great promises for the *future* that He has given him out of free grace (ver. 19); and 3) In view of the paternal kindness, wherein He has condescended to him in this *present revelation* of love (vers. 20, 21). "All without merit or worthiness of mine" (Luther).—A further special exhibition of humility is the occurrence of the word "servant" *three times* in vers. 18–21 and *seven times* in vers. 25–29. "This thanksgiving confirms anew the fact that the only foundation on which the true godliness and everlastingness of the kingdom can rest is the purity and holiness of an humble heart, and therefore the hearty and living humility of David's thanksgiving may give us the strongest assurance that here is really enthroned the culmination of all royal rule" (Baumgarten).—In the prayer humility is combined with *childlike fervor and sincerity*, wherewith: 1) God's *power and glory*, as revealed in His previous gracious deeds for His people, is praised and celebrated (vers. 22, 23); 2) God's *love*, wherein He acknowledges Himself to be His people's God and Lord, is declared (ver. 24); and 3) God's *name* is invoked from the depths of a heart full of the consciousness of His gracious presence. ("The name Jehovah occurs twelve times, and is ten times addressed. In the address the simple Jehovah occurs once, Adonai Jehovah six times, Jehovah Elohim twice, and Jehovah Sabaoth once. The address Adonai Jehovah is found at the beginning and at the end. The third division first takes up the divine names of the second, and then returns at the close to that of the first." Hengst., *ubi sup.*, 158.)—[Compare the use of divine names in the parallel passage in 1 Chron. xvii.—Tr.]). With humility and fervor is combined hearty *trust* 1) in the prayer for the *fulfilment* of the gracious *promise;* 2) in the *appeal* to the *truthfulness* of God's *word;* and 3) in the *confident hope* of God's *blessing* (vers. 25–29).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 1–11. "*The Lord is with thee*" (ver. 3). I. How the Lord owns Himself as thine: 1) In battle and victory over all thy enemies; 2) In the quietness and peace of thy heart; 3) In the blessing of thy house; 4) In the instructions of His word. II. How thou shouldst consequently place thyself with respect to the Lord: 1) In joyful willingness to prove thy gratitude to Him; 2) In humble obedience of faith to His will when it rejects thy thoughts; 3) In humbly letting thy house be built for thee by Him, and letting Him give to thee before thou wilt give to

Him; and 4) In awaiting with childlike confidence His blessing for the future.

Giving and Taking in the relation of man to God: 1) "A man can *receive* nothing, except it be *given* him from heaven;" but 2) A man can also give nothing to God the Lord, except it be first *given* him by the Lord.

"*I was with thee whithersoever thou wentest*" (ver. 9): 1) How far this divine testimony has been *confirmed* in the guidance of thy whole course of life; 2) How its truth should *qualify* thee to know His ways in the guidance of His people, and in the history of His kingdom; 3) What obligation is thereby *laid on* thee in relation to thy God.

Vers. 12–16. *The fulfilment of the great and gracious promise of God to David, in Christ the Son of David:* 1) In His *person*, He is not merely *David's* seed = seed of *the woman* = *Abraham's* seed, but also *God's Son;* 2) In His *office*, He is *King* over the kingdom of God, King of all kings; 3) In His *possession of power*, He has an *everlasting* kingdom, to Him is given all power in heaven and on earth; 4) In His *work*, He builds for the name of God the Father a *house*, a spiritual temple in humanity, out of living stones (comp. John ii. 19).

[Vers. 16, 17. Robert Hall: *The advantages of Civil Government contrasted with the blessings of the Spiritual Kingdom of Jesus Christ* (Works, Am. Ed., III., 444): 1) As to *security*, and the *sense* of security. 2) *Liberty.* 3) *Plenty.* 4) A tendency to *improvement* in social institutions. 5) *Stability.* —Tr.]

Vers. 18–24. *The greatness of the manifestations of God's grace:* 1) They infinitely surpass the desert and worthiness of sinful men (Who am I? *etc.*), ver. 18; 2) They fill all times, from the remotest past into the farthest future (vers. 18, 19); 3) They are high-exalted above all human thoughts and words, which cannot comprehend and express them (ver. 20); 4) They are deep-grounded in God's word and heart (ver. 21).

Vers. 22–24. *The right praise of God on the part of His people:* 1) Looking to that which He *is to them*, as their incomparably gracious God, and exclusively their own; 2) Looking to that which *He* as their *God* has *done* in them in the wonders of His redeeming might and love; and 3) Looking to that for which He has made them *His* people, and *prepared* them for Himself.

Vers. 25–29. *The right prayer and supplication of living faith:* 1) It *grounds* itself firmly in the word of God's *promise* (ver. 25); 2) It *aims* at nothing but the honor of God's *name* (ver. 26); 3) It *springs* from a heart which is moved by God's *promise* (ver. 27); 4) It appeals to God's faithfulness and *truth;* 5) It receives the fulness of God's promised *blessing*.

[Vers. 18–29. Henry: David's Prayer: 1) He speaks very humbly of himself, and his own merits (ver. 18). 2) He speaks very highly and honorably of God's favors to him (vers. 18–20). 3) He ascribes all to the free grace of God (ver. 21). 4) He adores the greatness and glory of God (ver. 22). 5) He expresses a great esteem for the Israel of God (vers. 23, 24). 5) He concludes with humble petitions to God (vers. 27–29).—Tr.]

Vers. 1–4. [Henry: When God in His providence gives us rest, and finds us little to do of worldly business, we must do so much the more for God and our souls. How different were the thoughts of David, when he sat in his palace, from Nebuchadnezzar's, when he walked in his, Dan. iv. 29, 30. —Tr.]—J. Lange: It is not enough to have a good design in a matter, but one must also have a particular assurance as to whether this or that is according to God's gracious will.—Schlier: Alas for us, if the Scriptures were nothing more than human, well-meant thoughts of holy men of God; who could then rely on them? who could live and die on them? But well for us that we have a word of God, a word out of God's own mouth, which God's Spirit has given us.—Vers. 4, 5. Wuert. Bible: God is much more desirous of giving to us than of receiving from us.—S. Schmid: God demands not so much splendid outward service, but rather an inner and honest service of the heart, Isa. iv. 24.—Schlier: The true house of God is His people; there would He make His abode in the hearts of His own. A human heart that opens itself to God is a temple more pleasing to Him than the stateliest structure of gold and marble, and a church that really has the Lord dwelling in its midst is in the sight of God more precious than the noblest showy building which sets all the world a wondering.

Vers. 8–11. We always indeed imagine that we must first give something to the Lord, and that if we have not been beforehand with Him, the Lord will not bless us; and yet what is all that we do, if the Lord has not first taken hold of us?—We must first experience the Lord's blessings in ourselves, and then first can we do any thing for Him in return.—Vers. 12–16. Starke: Christ's kingdom is a firmly established kingdom; even the gates of hell cannot prevail against it (Matt. xvi. 18).—Christ is the right architect of the spiritual house of God; and through Him alone can we become temples and abodes of the living God (1 Cor. vi. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 5).—Schlier: The true and living house of God, which He has built, is the church of the Lord which He has bought with His blood and gathered by His Spirit.

Ver. 17. S. Schmid: A faithful servant of God speaks according to the direction of God's word—takes nothing therefrom, and adds nothing thereto (Deut. xii. 32).—Ver. 18. Cramer: That is the true complexion of the saints: the more they are exalted by God and favored with gifts and goods, the more they humble themselves and count themselves unworthy thereof (Gen. xviii. 27; xxxii. 10; Luke i. 48).—Vers. 20, 21. Osiander: When a devout man's heart is stirred up by the Holy Spirit to gratitude towards God, it can often not find words enough to utter its hearty love, and to exalt God high enough over all (Luke i. 46 sq.).—Starke: In praying we must not merely recognize and acknowledge our unworthiness, but also praise God's grace and compassion (Luke i. 48–50).—Vers. 17–21. Schlier: God's goodness should awaken us to a recognition of our sins, it should bring us down on our knees, it should make us little and worthless. The more God the Lord does us good, so much the more should we humble ourselves; and the higher He places us, so much the more should we recognize our unworthiness; and when He lifts us up from the dust to the height and blesses us with the fullness of His blessing, then first should we be-

come thoroughly little and worthless in our own eyes.

Ver. 22. CRAMER: God demands of us not only the faith of the heart, but also the confession of our lips (Rom. x. 10).—Ver. 23. S. SCHMID: Not their own deeds make a people great, but the works of God which He does among such a people. Blessed is that people whose God is the Lord; but this blessedness comes from the mere compassion of God.—Vers. 22–24. SCHLIER: It is a great gain when, through God's benefits, we learn to recognize the benefactor, and let ourselves be drawn by God's goodness to the Lord Himself. God's goodness should make us little and worthless, and bow us down on our knees, but God's goodness should also make the Lord in our estimation ever greater, worthier and nobler.—Vers. 25, 26. CRAMER: Although we have God's fair and rich promises before us, and have once found grace, yet we should always continue to seek confirmation and increase thereof (1 Kings viii. 25, 26).

Ver. 28 sqq. BERL. BIBLE: The greatest act in praying is the persevering supplication of faith for the performance of God's blessed purpose; to hold fast the everlasting truth made known to us, and as if seeking payment of a debt to remind, urge, press, knock, beat the door.—STARKE: Every blessing in heavenly good things is derived from the gracious pleasure of God (Eph. i. 3).

[Ver. 2. It seems natural and appropriate that our houses of worship should be not less substantial and elegant than our dwelling-houses.—Ver. 3. The Lord's having evidently "been with us" does not prove that He approves all we have done; still less that He will approve all we feel inclined to do.—It may be perfectly proper that a thing should be done, and yet not proper that *we* should undertake to do it.—Our wisest friends may give us wrong counsel, in hastily taking for granted that what seems to them good will seem good to the Lord.—In denying us the gratification of some pious wish, God may design accomplishing it in a way that He sees to be better; and He may commend and reward the wish He does not gratify. ("Thou didst well that it was in thine heart," 1 Kings viii. 18).—A sermon on *Nathan*, chap. vii. 1–17 and xii. 1–14.

[Ver. 9. *Fame.*—"And have made thee a great name," *etc.* I. Fame is a gift of God's Providence—hence to be enjoyed with humility. II. Fame is one of God's noblest gifts—hence may be desired and earnestly sought, if righteously. III. Fame, like all other gifts, has weighty responsibilities—hence to be used for the good of men and the glory of God.—Ver. 14. "*I will be his father, and he shall be my son.*" This true—1) of Solomon and other descendants of David who were kings of Judah; 2) of Christ, "the son of David," Heb. i. 5; 3) Of every one who is a believer in Christ, and thus a child of God, 1 John iii. 1; v. 1. —TR.]

[Vers. 18–21. *A model of devout thanksgiving:* I. Over what he rejoices. 1) Over great blessings received in the past, ver. 18. 2) Over yet greater blessings promised in the future, ver. 19. II. In what spirit he regards these favors. 1) As utterly undeserved by himself, vers. 18, 20. 2) As the gift of God's *sovereign* grace, ver. 21; Matt. xi. 26.—Ver. 22. The greatness of *Israel's God* argued from the wonders of *Israel's history*. Comp. vers. 23, 24.—TR.]

[Ver. 27. *Promise and Prayer.* 1) The promise does not prevent prayer. 2) The promise authorizes prayer that would otherwise be presumptuous. 3) The promise gives assurance of success in prayer. Comp. vers. 28, 29.—TR.]

III. *The splendid development of David's royal rule without and within.*

CHAPTERS VIII.—X.

1. Without by wars and victories over Israel's external enemies. Chap. VIII. 1–14.

1 **AND after this it came to pass that David smote the Philistines and subdued [humbled] them; and David took Metheg-Ammah[1] out of the hand of the Philistines.**

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. We leave this obscure word untranslated. Erdmann renders it "the bridle of the mother," but the Heb. אַמָּה never means mother; so Philippson: "the bridle of the metropolis (capital city)." The ancient VSS. are discordant and unsatisfactory: Chald. has "the fastening of the Ammah," Vulg. "the bridle of tribute," Syr. and Arab. render a proper name Ramath-Gamah (which some translate "the height of the rush"), Aquila gives "the bridle of the aqueduct" or (according to another edition) "the bridle of the ell," Symmachus "the authority of tribute," while the Sept. reading τὴν ἀφωρισμένην suggests that their text contained the stem גרשׁ or חרשׁ. These renderings show the perplexity of the translators; the Rabbinical translation "stream or aqueduct" (so perhaps Chald.) is improbable, and the rendering "tribute" equally without authority (= הַמַּס), while the reading in Chron. "Gath and her daughters" is an explanation, not a translation, if it be not a different form of the same original text. In this uncertainty it seems better to leave the words untranslated, as in Eng. A. V. Perhaps we have here a proper name, possibly a corruption of the text of Chronicles.—TR.]

2 And he smote Moab and measured them with a line, casting them down to
[making them lie down on] the ground; even with two lines measured he [and
he measured two lines] to put to death and with [*om.* with] one[2] full line to keep
alive. And *so* [*om.* so] the Moabites became David's servants and brought [bring-
ing] gifts.
3 David smote also [And David smote] Hadadezer[3] the son of Rehob, king of Zo-
bah, as he went to recover his border at [to make an attack at[4]] the river Euph-
4 rates.[5] And David took from him a thousand *chariots*[6] and seven hundred horse-
men and twenty thousand footmen; and David houghed all the chariot *horses*, but
reserved of them *for* an hundred chariots.
5 And when the Syrians[7] of Damascus came to succour Hadadezer king of Zobah,
6 David slew of the Syrians two and twenty thousand men. Then [And] David
put garrisons in Syria of Damascus, and the Syrians became servants to David and
brought [bringing] gifts. And the Lord [Jehovah] preserved David whitherso-
7 ever he went. And David took the shields[8] of gold that were on the servants of
8 Hadadezer, and brought them to Jerusalem. And from Betah[9] and from Berothai,
cities of Hadadezer, king David took exceeding much brass [copper].
9 When [And] Toi king of Hamath heard that David had smitten all the host of
10 Hadadezer, Then [And] Toi sent Joram[10] his son unto king David. to salute him
and to bless [congratulate] him, because he had fought against Hadadezer and
smitten him; for Hadadezer had wars with Toi; and *Joram* brought with him [and
in his hand were] vessels of silver and vessels of gold and vessels of brass [copper].
11 Which [These] also king David did dedicate unto the Lord [Jehovah] with the
silver and gold that he had dedicated of all [*ins.* the] nations which he subdued,
12 Of Syria[11] and of Moab and of the children of Ammon and of the Philistines and
of Amalek and of the spoil of Hadadezer son of Rehob, king of Zobah.
13 And David gat him a name when he returned from smiting of [*om.* of] the Sy-
14 rians[12] in the valley of salt, *being* [*om.* being] eighteen thousand *men*. And he put
garrisons in Edom; throughout all Edom put he garrisons, and all they of [*om.*
they of] Edom became David's servants. And the Lord [Jehovah] preserved
David whithersoever he went.

[2] [Ver. 2. Sept. has "two lines to kill and two to save," and Vulg. gives one line to each division (and so the Syr. in Walton's Polyglot, followed by Arab., but Lee's Syr. text agrees with the Heb.); these are changes from desire for symmetry.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 3. Erdmann and many others prefer this form *Hadadezer* to the form in Chron., *Hadarezer* (which is found in all the ancient VSS. except Chald., and in many good Heb. MSS. and EDD.) on the ground that Hadad is the name of a Syrian sun-god and occurs in many other proper names; but Schrader (*Die Keilinschriften und das A. T.*, p. 101) says that the name of the Syrian king in 1 Kings xx. 1 is not Benhadad, but Ben-hadar, which the Assyrian writes Binhidri; Schrader translates the name ("the god) Bin is exalted." If this be correct, the reading here is probably Hadarezer, as in Chron.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 3. Our text is here to be preferred to that of Chron. (xviii. 3). Erdmann renders "to re-establish his power," nearly as Eng. A. V. But the phrase here used always means "to turn one's hand" either literally (as 1 Sam. xiv. 27) or figuratively, and either from (מִן) a thing (Ex. xviii. 17) or to or against a thing (אֶל in Ex. iv. 7 עַל in Am. i. 8); here, as not the enemy against whom, but the place in which the effort is made is meant the prep. "in" (בְּ) is used; he went to "put his hand, direct his attack" in or at the river.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 3. The word "Euphrates," not in the text, is supplied by the Masorites in the margin, and is found in many MSS. and EDD.; its insertion in the Heb. is unnecessary, since "the river" means the Euphrates.—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 4. The Heb. here reads: "1700 horsemen and 20,000 footmen;" Eng. A. V. divides the first number and introduces "chariots" in order to account for their mention at the end of the verse (after 1 Chr. xviii. 4); Erdmann adopts the whole of the reading of Chron. "1000 chariots, 7000 horsemen, and 20,000 footmen" (so also Sept. and Then.). But Wellhausen objects to this that the רכב at the end is used in a general sense, including the horses of the "horsemen,"—inasmuch as after all the רכב only are houghed, there remain only 100 רכב "chariot-horses" and not also the "riding-horses." Still, as the author may here have chosen to leave out the riding-horses altogether, this objection would not be decisive; but it is in favor of our text that, while not impossible, it is not so easy as that of Chron.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 5. Syr. and Arab. read badly "Edom and Damascus."—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 7. The versions render this word (שלט) variously, apparently guessing at its meaning from the connection. As Thenius points out, the etymology (from a verb meaning "to be hard or strong") and some of the passages where it occurs (as Jer. li. 11) favor the meaning "armour;" the rendering "shield" is now more commonly adopted.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 8. The probability seems to be in favor of the reading "Tebah."—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 10. The better reading is probably Hadoram (as in Chron.), with which compare the Hadar-ezer above.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 12. Some MSS. and Sept., Syr., Arab. read "Edom," a change of one letter only in the Hebrew, and this better suits the connection, where this name is followed by Moab, *etc.*, Zobah appearing at the end.—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 13. As Syria was not near the valley of salt, this text is manifestly corrupt. We may either read "Edom" for "Syria" (so Sept. and Chron.) or insert the clause "and smote Edom" after "Syrians" (so Erdmann). The former course is the simpler, and avoids the difficulty of accounting for the omission of any reference to Syria in Chronicles. The Heb. words for Syria (ארם) and Edom (אדם) differ very slightly.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

A general *survey* is here given of David's *wars* and *victories* with the aid of the Lord (vers. 6, 14), without its being indicated, however (as is above observed), by the word "after this" that the wars here detailed were chronologically attached to the events of chap. vii., or that these wars were chronologically related to one another as the sequence of mention might seem to show. The phrase "after this" is the general formula of transition and connection, which introduces David's wars grouped according to the factual point of view, and works them into the broad frame of the theocratic history. See a similar loose, not strictly chronological connection by this formula in x. 1; xiii. 1. The parallel section in 1 Chron. is chap. xviii.

Ver. 1. *The subjection of the Philistines.* David not only defeated them in a *battle*, but also subjected them to his *authority*. He took out of their hand "the bridle of the mother"* (מֶתֶג הָאַמָּה *metheg ha ammah*). The Chronicler has for this "Gath and her daughters," which words are to be accepted in explanation of our expression instead of giving place to vague conjectures. *Ammah* (אַמָּה, feminine formation from אֵם) = "mother-city;" so the capital city of a country is often called in Arabic and Phœnician, comp. Gesen. *Thesaurus*, p. 112, and our word "metropolis;" and the cities dependent on the capital city are called "daughters," comp. Josh. xv. 45, 47. Among the five chief cities of the Philistines (1 Sam. vi. 16, 17), *Gath* in Saul's time already, as seat of a king who appears at the head of the Philistine princes (1 Sam. xxvii. 2; xxix. 2 sq.), had attained the rank of a capital of Philistia, whence the bridle of dominion was extended over the other cities and the whole people. [These notices do not seem sufficient in themselves to show a hegemony for Gath.—Tr.] The "*bridle of the mother*"—that is, according to Chron., the power and authority over Philistia concentrated in the metropolis, Gath, the mother with the "daughters," or Philistine cities over which Gath exercised authority—David took possession of, he subjugated Philistia, and made it tributary, as the nations afterwards mentioned. The king of Gath mentioned in 1 Kings ii. 39 belonged also to the tributary kings, subject to Solomon, this side of the Euphrates, as far as Gaza (1 Kings v. 1, 4). So Gesenius, De Wette, Keil. Of other explanations of our phrase some do not accord with the meaning of the words, *e. g.*, Schultens, Mich., Ewald render "*arm*-bridle," but *ammah* does not mean "arm," and Grotius gives *claustra montis Ammæ*—"the fortress of Mount Ammah,"—but *metheg* cannot mean "fortress." Some do not agree with the actual condition of things, *e. g.*, Bertheau explains, "he wrested from the Philistines the *dominion* that they had hitherto exercised over Israel," but this does not agree with David's dominion over Israel; and Böttcher takes *ammah*—(אֵם)—as meaning one that goes before and leads, and then in the abstract sense of leading, guidance, "the bridle of *guidance*,"—but "this would suit only if the setting aside of a hegemony were here spokeu of" (Then.). Looking at the words of Chron., the Sept. (*τὴν ἀφωρισμένην* = "the separated, marked off") and 1 Sam. vii. 13, 14, Thenius conjectures that the text has arisen by error of copyists from an original text, which contained a description (that cannot now be made out) of the boundary-district, which David then forever wrested from the Philistines. In the essence of the thing, this explanation agrees with that above given.

Ver. 2. *The subjugation of the Moabites.*—On the former friendly relation between the king of Moab and David, see 1 Sam. xxii. 3, 4. The cause of Moab's enmity against him is unknown. Perhaps meantime another king had come to the throne than he with whom David sought refuge and with his parents found hospitality. Probably in this war occurred what is mentioned in 1 Chron. xi. 22 of Benaiah, one of David's heroes, that he slew two of the king of Moab's sons. The severe punishment inflicted on the arms-bearing Moabites (they were compelled to lie in a row on the ground, two thirds were measured with a line for death, and one-third for life) points to some very grave offence on their part. They thenceforward became David's servants, that is, were subject to him and paid him tribute. [Patrick: Now was fulfilled the prophecy of Balaam, Numb. xxiv. 17.—Tr.]

Vers. 3, 4. *Subjugation of Hadadezer, king of Zobah.*—**And David smote Hadadezer.**—Instead of this name we have "Hadarezer" in x. 16, 19, and in Chron.; so also Sept., Vulg., Syr., Arab., Josephus. But as *Hadad* was the name of the sun-god of the Syrians, and frequently occurs in Syrian proper names (see Movers, *Phœn.* I. 196 sq.), Hadadezer, = "whose help God is," must be taken as the original reading. [For a different view see "Text. and Gramm."—Tr.] The district of *Zobah* was a part of Syria (x. 6, 16 and Psalm lx. 2, where it is called *Aram*-Zobah), bordering on Syria, beyond the Euphrates in Mesopotamia, whence Hadadezer brought Arameans to his help across the Euphrates. Its position is more exactly described in ver. 5 (it was near the territory of the *Damascus* Syrians) and ver. 9 and 2 Chron. viii. 3 (it touched Hamath on the north, at the Orontes). It must therefore be put north-east of Damascus and south of Hamath, between the Orontes and the Euphrates. Comp. Winer, *R.-B.* II. 738. It seems to have reached so far south that the Ammonites could get help from it against Israel, x. 6; 1 Chron. xix. 6. As Zobah was doubtless the capital city of the country, it is probably (Grot., Ew.) to be identified with the city *Sabe* (*Ptol.* v. 19) which lay on the same parallel with Damascus and eastward towards the Euphrates.* "We must therefore look for Zobah to the east of the transjordanic Israelitish territory and beyond its northern border, and its king must have ruled over a great part of the desert between Palestine and the Euphrates, and consequently over the southern part of Syria" (Stähelin, *Leben Davids*, p. 51). But on what occasion and under what circumstances was David involved in a war

* [On this phrase see "Text. and Gramm." For various explanations see Poole's *Synopsis* and Bochart's *Hieroz.* II. p. 225.—Tr.]

* [See Art. *Zobah* in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*—Tr.]

with this distant kingdom? The answer to this question will appear in the course of the following exposition. **As he went to re-establish his power at the river** (Euphrates). [Lit. "as he went to put forth his hand"=to make an effort or attack. See "Text. and Gramm." against Erdmann's rendering.—Tr.] The question is whether Hadadezer or David is subject here. The Heb. יָד [hand]=power, dominion. The Infin. (הָשִׁיב) means not *to stretch out, extend* (De Wette), but to draw back, *re-establish* a dominion, which consequently existed before. Taking Hadadezer as subject, and looking to 1 Sam. xiv. 47, where it is said that *Saul* fought successfully against Zobah, it has been explained to mean that Hadadezer now attempted to regain the territory then lost (Maurer, Bunsen, Ewald, Keil). But can we suppose that Hadadezer waited so long after Saul's death? Rather it is to be presumed that he had long ago re-established his power. In favor of taking *David* as subject, it may be said that the whole sentence would then have the same subject, which is most natural according to the tenor of the narrative, and that David must have felt called on to restore Israel's power up to the Euphrates which had been lost since Saul's time. But *against* this undoubtedly is the word "*his* power" (יָדוֹ); for David had not yet occupied the land on the Euphrates. We are therefore obliged to take *Hadadezer* as subject, who had attempted to restore his shattered power on the Euphrates when David conquered him in this war and made him his vassal. How his power was shattered will appear hereafter. Chron. has "to establish" (הַצִּיב), which agrees with the above explanation —and so the Sept. ἐπιστῆσαι [=establish]. Which was the original reading cannot be determined. [The phrase in Sam. is a common one; that in Chron. (in the Heb.) is difficult and improbable. —Tr.] Against the rendering of Grot. and Cler.: "as he (David) went to force back his (Hadadezer's) power towards the Euphrates" is the prep. "in, at" (בְּ) before "river," and the change of persons in this subordinate sentence (Thenius). [Adopting the rendering suggested above, the reference may very well be to David as the subject: David going to make an attack at the Euphrates, was naturally opposed by the powerful Hadadezer; otherwise it is difficult to see how Hadadezer's attack in this region could have brought him in contact with David.—Tr.] The Masora adds "Euphrates" after "river" [so Eng. A. V.],— which, however, is not necessary, since the word "the river" (הַנָּהָר) of itself means the Euphrates.* How important it must have been for David to rest his power on this side on the Euphrates is obvious. Ver. 4. **And David took** (prisoners) **from him 1700 horsemen and 20,000 footmen.**—Chron. has 7000 horsemen and 1000 chariots. Here, therefore, the word "chariot" has fallen out, and the sign for seven thousand (ז̈) been changed to that for seven hundred (ז). The text of Chron. is the correct one; "for to 20,000 footmen in the plains of Syria 7000 horsemen is evidently better proportioned than 1700"(Thenius). The 1000 *chariots* also accords with the connection, "because afterward David is said to have houghed the chariot-horses" (Cler.). **And David lamed all the riding-animals.** —The word (רֶכֶב) means riding-animals in general, not merely chariot-horses (so Isa. xxi. 7). These David made useless and harmless by cutting the sinews of their hind feet (עִקֵּר—comp. Judg. xi. 6, 9). It was a matter of importance to David to render useless not the *chariots*, but the *horses*. [He reserved a hundred horses not for war, but for a triumph or a guard; whether or not this reservation was illegal and ungodly is not said.—Tr.]

Vers. 5–8. *The conquest of Aram-Damascus* (*the Syrians of Damascus*). Ver. 5. **Aram-Damascus**—that is, the Aramæans whose capital was *Damascus* (Chron. *Darmesek*, Sam. *Dammesek*)— east of the Antilibanon range, on the Chrysorrhoas (Pharpar) river, and on the great caravan-route from Central Asia to Western Asia. These Syrians of Damascus came as allies to the help of Hadadezer, attacking David from the north, but suffered a severe defeat, as appears from the fact that they lost 22,000 men. [See Josephus' reference here to the account of Nicolaus of Damascus (*Ant.* 7, 5, 2), who mentions a Syrian king Hadad beaten at the Euphrates by David (Then.).—Tr.] —Ver. 6. To hold them in subjection he placed *posts, garrisons* in their territory, comp. 1 Sam. x. 5; xiii. 3. "He made them *subject* and *tributary* to him." [Some render "officers" instead of "garrisons," but hardly so well.—Tr.]—Ver. 7. "Shields" (שְׁלָטִם), *not* "armour," comp. 2 Kings xi. 10, Gesen., Thes. and Lex. by Dietrich. The *golden shields* of Hadadezer's servants (that is, his immediate guard) David sent as booty to *Jerusalem*. The Sept. here has the additional statement: "And Susakim [Shishak] king of Egypt took them away when he went up against Jerusalem in the days of Roboam, son of Solomon," of which there is no trace in any other version or in Chron., and which there is no good reason for introducing into our text (against Thenius), since, by comparing 1 Chron. xviii. 8 (where the use made of the copper is mentioned), and 1 Kings xiv. 25–27, it is clear how a translator or copyist from inexact observation of these passages might have been led to make such an addition to the text as marginal note or explanation. [Keil also points out that the shields carried off by Shishak were not these captured by David, but those made by Solomon.—Tr.]—Ver. 8. **And from Hadadezer's cities Betah and Berothai took king David very much copper.**—It is not possible to determine certainly the position of these cities. But it may be conjectured that *Berothai* (comp. Ezek. xlvii. 16), for which Chron. has *Kun*, is identical either with *Barathena*, near Sabe (Ptol. *Geog.* 5, 19, 5; so Ewald), or with the present *Berah* south-east of Damascus (Thenius), or with *Birtha* on the eastern bank of the Euphrates (= *Birtha*, Ptol. *Geog.* 5, 19, 3), not to be confounded with Birtha, on the Tigris (Ptol. *Geog.* 5, 18, 9). The old Phœnician Berytus on the Mediterranean Sea (=Beirut) is out of the question, since the territory of the king of Zobah could certainly not have reached so far. "The name may be derived as well from *berosh* [cypress], in Syrian *beroth*, as

* [As in Ps. lxxii. 8: "from the river to the ends of the earth" (south of Egypt), and so 1 Mac. vii. 8. As the Nahar is the Euphrates, so the Yeor is the Nile.—Tr.]

from *beer* [a well]" (Thenius). See Winer *s. v.* (*Bib. Comm.:* Can the Wady Barada be the modern representative of the name?—Tr.] Instead of *Betah* Chron. has *Tibhath*, to which answer the *Metebak* of the Sept. and the *Tebah* of the Syriac —so that we may suppose "from Tebah" (מִטֶּבַח) to be the original reading (Then., Keil). This is favored by the *Tebah* of Gen. xxii. 24 (which points to this region), the name of a son of Nahor, and also of a place that now stands north of Damascus and Tadmor, between Tadmor and Aleppo (Büsching, *Erdbeschreib.* XI., I., 544). The booty of these cities consisted of a large quantity of copper. Chronicles (either, as Movers supposes, taking it from another source, or using more completely the same source as the author of Samuel) adds in respect to the use of the booty: "Therefrom Solomon made the copper sea and the pillars and the coppern vessels." The Sept. adds these words here after "very much brass" with the insertion "and the wash-basins." But there is no reason with Thenius to alter our text accordingly, since the effort of the Sept. to explain and fill out from other material is evident here, as in ver. 7. [On copper in Canaan see Deut. viii. 9. Some centuries before this copper was carried in quantities from Syria to Egypt [*Bib. Com.*).—Tr.]—The loss of the Syrians in these battles was forty-two thousand men (comp. vers. 4 and 5). This number agrees with the statement of the loss in x. 18 = forty thousand men. From this alone it is clear that the Aramæan war that is minutely related in ch. x. is the same as that here spoken of. It is to be further noted that the war against the Aramæans here related ends with their complete subjection (vers. 6 and 9). Against the view that ch. x. narrates a second Aramæan war, wherein the subjugated Aramæans revolt when David becomes involved in war with the Ammonites, and help them against him, is the fact that in ch. x. nothing is said of such a revolt, the Syrians appearing as wholly independent of David and hiring their aid to the Ammonites (x. 6). Before the Aramæans could unite with these latter, Joab defeated them under Hadadezer; the latter called the Aramæans from beyond the Euphrates to his help in order to regain his power on the Euphrates, which was lost by that defeat, and they were now also defeated by David (x. 13–18). This explains our ver. 3: "as he (Hadadezer) went to re-establish his power at the river Phrath" (Luther). In the general view of David's wars in ch. viii. this Aramæan war is briefly related according to its issue under David's lead. In ch. x. the Ammonitish war (here merely alluded to, ver. 12) is minutely related on account of the history of Uriah therewith connected; and as this war led to that with the Aramæans, the latter also, after the summary statement of it in ch. viii., is fully narrated in ch. x. "The war with Ammon, whose development could not be understood without the Syrian, is more elaborately narrated (in ch. x.) for a special reason only, namely, for the sake of Uriah's history, and is for this reason no doubt merely mentioned in the general view of all the great wars (viii. 12), since otherwise its issue at least would necessarily have been described as fully as that of the Moabite war" (Ewald, *Gesch.* [*Hist. of Israel*] III. 205). Comp. Keil's *Comm.*,[Eng. Tr., p. 358 sq.]—According to 1 Chron. xviii. 3 David's decisive victory over the Aramæans was gained at *Hamath*, that is, Epiphania on the Orontes, a colony of the Canaanites (Gen. x. 18), at the foot of Hermon, therefore on the western boundary of the district of Zobah, and on the northernmost border of Palestine, still one of the greatest cities of Turkish Asia, retaining its old name; according to 2 Sam. x. 17 the victory was gained at *Helam*, an unknown place; but this difference is insignificant, and may be removed by supposing either that Helam was near Hamath (Keil), or that the decisive combats occurred at both places at the same time.*

Vers. 9, 10. *King Toi of Hamath seeks a friendly alliance with David in consequence of the latter's victory over the king of Zobah and his allies.*—For Toi Chron. has Toü. **When Toi heard that David had smitten all the host of Hadadezer** (David's victory was therefore a decisive one), **he sent his son Joram** (better **Hadoram**) **to David**. Chron., instead of Joram, has *Hadoram*, Joseph. *Adoram*, and Sept. *Jeddouram; Hadoram* (according to Mich., from Hador, the name of a Syrian deity, but see also Gen. x. 27; 1 Chron. i. 21, where it is the name of an Arabian tribe) is to be regarded as the original reading, instead of the Heb. name Joram, which doubtless got into the text from similarity of sound by error of copying or of hearing [or, it is a Hebraization of a foreign name, as often happens.—Tr.]. The embassy was 1) to *greet* David in Toi's name, properly, to ask after his welfare, comp. Gen. xliii. 27, and 2) to *bless* him, that is, to congratulate him on his victory over Hadadezer. The reason for this congratulation is given in the words: "for a man of wars of Toi was Hadadezer," that is, Hadadezer carried on constant wars with Toi; Aq. and Sym. have "waging war" (πολεμῶν). On the phrase: "man of wars" = one whose call and business is warring, comp. 1 Chron. xxviii. 3; Isa. xlii. 13. Since *Hamath* and *Zobah* bordered on one another, Toi was in constant danger of being entirely despoiled of his authority by Hadadezer, on whom he was perhaps in some degree dependent. Hence his congratulation of David as the expression of *joy* over the victory that freed him from a dangerous enemy, and of the *wish* to enter into a relation of friendship and alliance with the powerful victor, to which end he sent *rich presents* consisting of vessels of *silver*, of *gold*, and of *copper*. [For the forms of ancient Chaldean and Assyrian vessels see Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies* I. 91, 386. —Tr.]

Vers. 11, 12. *David consecrates to the Lord all the booty of gold and silver taken from the conquered nations.* David's wars were wars of *the Lord*, in whose name he fought against the enemies of the chosen people, and led the people to victory. Therefore the booty belonged actually to the Lord. David affirmed this by separating it from profane use (this is the primary meaning of "*dedicated*," הִקְדִּישׁ), and setting it apart for the Lord, that is, either in general he put it into the treasury of the sanctuary, or he determined that it should be used in making sacred vessels for the

* [See notes on 2 Sam. x. 16.—Tr.]

temple that was to be built. Instead of the second "dedicated" (הִקְדִּישׁ) Chron. has "took" (נָשָׂא), which gives the same sense.—Ver. 12. **From Aram [-Syria] and from Moab and from the children of Ammon and from the Philistines and from Amalek and from the spoil of Hadadezer.** Instead of *Aram* Chron. has *Edom*, and omits the words referring to Hadadezer, that is, makes no mention at all of the wars against Aram. But as in this enumeration of all David's wars (as it obviously is) *Aram* could not, as it seems, be properly omitted, it might appear probable that we should read *Aram* in Chron. instead of *Edom*, especially as the victory over Edom is not mentioned till afterwards. It might, however, be also supposed that "Aram" was omitted [in Chron.] because the booty taken from the Aramæans has just been spoken of, and the further mention of booty from other nations was attached immediately to that statement. On the other hand it is not necessary (with Keil) to suppose a gap in our text after "Aram," that is to be filled with "from Edom." It may be supposed that, as the Chronicler did not mention Aram because he had spoken of it just before, so our narrator did not include Edom because he intended to speak of the victory over the Edomites immediately afterwards. [On this reading see "Text. and Gram." As Edom is geographically connected with Moab and Ammon, and as the spoil of the Syrian Hadadezer is mentioned at the end of the verse, it seems better (with *Bib. Com.*) to read *Edom* for *Aram;* though the Aram of our text might refer to the Syrians of Damascus (so Gill).—Tr.]

Vers. 13, 14. *Conquest of Edom.* Comp. 1 Chr. xviii. 12, 13, where it is said that Abishai, the son of Zeruiah, smote *the Edomites* in *the valley of salt*, eighteen thousand men, and the statements in Ps. lx. 2 [superscription] and 1 Kings xi. 15, which vary from this in minor points.—Ver. 13. **And David made himself a name.** Against the rendering "he set up a *monument*" is the fact that such a statement could not have been made here without reference to *the Lord* and indication of the *place*, and that it is wholly irreconcilable with David's disposition that he should here set up a monument to himself. The proper translation is: "made himself a name" (comp. Gen. xi. 4, xxi. 1) gained renown (so the Vulg.), Chap. vii. 9, "I have made thee a great name," *etc.*, is not in contradiction with this, for it points out the *divine causality* in David's glorious military career as contrasted with its *human side*.—The glory of his name was exalted still more by another splendid achievement. **As he returned from the battle against Aram,** literally, from smiting Aram. The connection alone naturally suggests that the Aramæan wars related above are here meant. But our text affirms David made himself a name by a *new victory* over *Aram* in the valley of salt. The text is here obviously incomplete. The words "in the valley of salt" cannot be connected with what here precedes, since a battle with the Aramæans in this valley, which lay on the ancient border of Judah and Edom in the Edomite territory south of the Dead Sea, is out of the question. Before these words we must insert "*and he smote Edom*," which may easily have fallen out in copying through the similarity of *Edom* and *Aram* (אדם and ארם). Sept: "he smote Idumea." [Or, we may read *Edom* instead of *Aram* (Syria), comp. 1 Chr. xviii. 12, and see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.] David's wars in the north against the Aramæans and Ammonites had led the *Edomites* to fancy that they might easily get possession of the southern part of the Israelitish territory. When David had ended those wars, he returned (the word "returned" does not refer to Joab (Ew.)—see below). Whether he returned on the east or west of the Jordan and the Dead Sea is uncertain. The battle with the Edomites was then fought in the salt valley, the same place where Amaziah afterwards conquered the Edomites (2 Kings xiv. 7). The Edomites lost eighteen thousand men; so also *Chron.* But in Chron. the battle is fought not by David himself, but by *Abishai*, the son of Zeruiah, and in 1 Kings xi. 15 and in Ps. lx. 2 [superscription] by *Joab*. There are here no real contradictions, since in different reports (for ex., in the last German-French war) the same battles are referred to different leaders, in one to the Fieldmarshal, in another to his subordinate Generals, in still another to the Generalissimo himself. Abishai, who in the Syrian-Ammonitish war commanded a division of David's army under Joab, was the conqueror of the Edomites, while Joab was General-in-chief, and David had control of the whole military operation. Michaelis: "David as king, Joab as chief commander, and Abishai, who was sent forward by his brother, and overthrew the enemy." Only incapacity to conceive such affairs in their reality and manifoldness can find a discrepancy here. For the rest it is to be noted that the Chronicler, though he names Abishai as leader in this victory, was at the same time thinking of *David* as the conqueror (in accord with our passage), since he adds: "And the Lord helped David in all his undertakings." The difference in numbers also (here and in Chron. eighteen thousand, in Ps. lx. twelve thousand) is unimportant; there is no need to suppose an error of copyist in the last passage (Ew.) to explain it. It receives a simple explanation from the various statements about the battle in different authorities. In the last German-French war the reports of the numbers of killed or prisoners often differed by thousands. How much more might such differences arise at a time when so exact countings were not provided for. [Bp. Patrick suggests that Abishai began the fight and slew six thousand, and then Joab, advancing with his reserve, slew twelve thousand more (so Ps. lx). It is impossible to give a certain explanation of the difference.—Tr.] **David put garrisons in all Edom** (not in Chron). Thenius supposes the reason of the special emphatic statement *here* (comp. ver. 6), that no part of Edom was left without a garrison, to be that this was not the case in former campaigns against Edom (see for ex. 1 Sam. xiv. 47). But the explanation lies rather in the numerous mountains, caves and gorges of the country, which made a complete garrisoning necessary.—Thus had David overthrown the huge column of nations that were dangerous to Israel from north to south, and on its ruins founded his dominion.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. In all his *wars and victories* over Israel's enemies David, as theocratic king, was only the *instrument of the Lord*, who Himself waged these wars for His people. Therefore in his royal military calling David knows himself also only as *servant of the Lord*, to whom, as the true Commander, he consecrates and dedicates the booty gained. And the prophetical narrative can say nothing higher of David than that he performed these splendid deeds of arms through *the help of the Lord* (vers. 6, 14). But in these victories over the enemies of God's people was fulfilled *the Lord's promise* (vii. 10, 11), trusting in which David could advance to battle *prepared for war* and *certain of victory*.

2. David's *royal calling* was to be fulfilled chiefly in wars and victories over Israel's enemies, in order that the kingdom of God in Israel might attain its unhindered, theocratic-national full development of form. But from this historical basis is subsequently developed the idea of the theocratic kingdom as a mighty and powerful one that victoriously combats the enemies of the theocracy, and makes them subservient to the divine might and power. On this is then built up the Messianic prophecy of the future king, who in divine might and glory will complete the kingdom of God by the thorough conquest of all its enemies, establish God's universal dominion in the people of God redeemed from the world-powers, and dispense God's blessing under His protection and pastoral fidelity. Compare especially Ps. ii., lxxii., cx., which in their historical foundation and fundamental ideas are unintelligible without the history of David's wars and victories (ch. viii.) that lays the foundation both for the Messianic prophecy and for the promise in ch. vii.

3. Under the guidance of Ps. lx.—which refers to the impending new war with the Edomite (after the glorious conclusion of the Syrian-Ammonite war) and to Israel's new danger from their inroad (Delitzsch, Moll), not to the situation after the victory over Edom in the Salt-valley (Hengst.)—it is possible to follow the ups and downs of David's thoughts under the experiences of this time and afterwards in his recollection of its trials and God's gracious manifestations, and to exhibit the truths therein contained that hold good for God's kingdom in all times. After the days of mighty manifestations of divine help there have come for God's people times of great distress within and without, not, however, by chance, by a necessary natural process or by unavertable fate, but immediately from the Lord. The deep powerful feeling of the absolute dependence of all human life on the Lord permits no lament over calamity, without accompanying declaration that the Lord has sent it according to His unsearchable counsel, and without giving Him the glory by the confession: "This hath the Lord done!" So David's lament in vers. 3-5 [1-3] is such a declaration and confession of the Lord's omnipotent power in the infliction of severe sufferings and great dangers on His people. "O God, thou hast cast us off, thou hast scattered us, made the land tremble and broken it, hast made thy people see hard things, *etc.*"—But with such lament and confession is connected in the pious heart the *living remembrance* of God's former manifestations of favor in His promises, as the banner that is raised by the Lord for them that fear Him. Thereby has the Lord Himself given His assailed ones the right to *remind* Him of His promises, and so the lament changes into the prayer: Help, answer us! (vers. 6, 7 [4, 5]). Praying faith *hears* the divine answer in the might-displaying *word* of the living *God* ("God hath spoken in His holiness") wherein He announces Himself as the unlimited Owner and Lord of His land and people, and as the victorious opponent and sovereign of their enemies. These are the two fundamental truths that the history of God's kingdom everywhere affirms and confirms: the Lord acknowledges His people (as His possession) with His promises and their fulfilment; and the enemies of God's kingdom and people will not be able to elude His power, but must submit to it (vers. 8-10 [6-8]). But in how sharp *contradiction* of such divine promises is the actual condition of God's people in the world? "Hast thou not cast us off?" Dost thou not go forth with our hosts? (vers. 11, 12 [9, 10]). [The translation of the Eng. A. V. is also possible, and gives the same general sense.—Tr.]. The above lament is repeated in such a *question*, which arises from the involuntary comparison of the present straitened condition of God's kingdom and people with the majestic declaration of God that promises victory and dominion over all enemies. This sharp dissonance must penetrate deep into the heart of God's servant when he sees with equal vividness and clearness both the rich promises of God and the needs and straits of God's kingdom. But it is resolved into all the *more pressing* entreaty and prayer for the *divine help* and into the twofold confident avowal and confession: 1) In *God we* shall show our power, that is, carry off the victory, and 2) God the Lord, who is in His people, will through them destroy the power of the enemy (vers. 13, 14 [11, 12]). The Psalm ceases with the same twofold ground-tone that sounds through 2 Sam. viii. David made himself a name by his victories over his enemies, and the Lord helped him whithersoever he went.

Nearly related to Ps. lx. is Ps. xliv.,* which similarly presupposes the affliction of God's people and the danger of their conquest and dispersion by the hostile neighboring nations. Through the Lord's *help* to the fathers when the land was taken possession of (vers. 2-4 [1-3]) is awakened and sustained *faith* that the same God, as king of His people, will now also grant His people victory over their enemies (vers. 5-8 [4-7]), so that they shall forever thank Him as they have hitherto boasted of Him (ver. 9 [8]). But in contradiction of this tradition of divine help in the olden time and of this confidence is *the present overthrow and distress of the people* (vers. 10-17 [9-16]) which is felt all the more deeply in view of the people's *faithfulness to the covenant*, as the

* [The permanent and deep calamity portrayed in this Psalm makes it extremely difficult, if not quite impossible to refer it to the time of David. There is great room for doubt also as to the Davidic origin of Ps. lx. See the Comms. of Delitzsch and Perowne on Psalms for discussions of this point.—Tr.]

omniscient God knows (vers. 18–22 [17–21]). But the consciousness of undeserved sufferings and afflictions leads to the *profounder conviction* that such sufferings, inflicted by the Lord, must be endured for the Lord's sake, since the enmity towards the Lord's people is directed against the Lord Himself (ver. 23 [22]). Therewith, however, is connected also the *hope* of God's people, as expressed in their prayer that the Lord would arise from His inactivity and espouse His people's cause. The ground of this hope and prayer lies in their *need of help* and in the *free grace of God*. Ps. xliv., being thus similar to Ps. lx. in its course of thought and its historical presuppositions, most probably belongs to the time of affliction expressly designated in Ps. lx., when the Edomites sorely pressed Israel; comp. Am. i. 6. The frightful castigation that Joab inflicted on them (1 Kings xi. 15) intimates the greatness of the suffering that they had prepared for Israel, and thus serves indirectly to confirm the historical circumstances presupposed in these two Psalms.—In Ps. cviii. we find a repetition of Ps. lx. 7–14 [5–12]) loosely combined with another Psalm-fragment lvii. 8–12 [7–11]).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

War is right and a duty before God, when the object is 1) To guard God's law and order against hostile power; 2) To preserve gifts and goods granted by God; 3) To fulfil tasks assigned by God; 4) To carry out the clearly recognized plans of God's wisdom.

Ver. 1. SCHLIER: We see here . . . how it still is at the present day with wars in the world, what righteous and unrighteous wars properly are, but also what wars always ought to be.—Ver. 2. TUEB. BIBLE: To pious kings God gives victory and glory. Prov. xx. 28.—OSIANDER: That is the most glorious victory and the most fortunate government, when the conquered enemies do not hate the conqueror, but hold him in honor and render him willing obedience.—Vers. 3, 4. OSIANDER: If the mightiest foes could not subdue David, so too no human power will extirpate the kingdom of Christ.—S. SCHMID: Against God and those who trust in God no human might avails (Prov. xxix. 25). When the kingdom of God is the object of attack, the ungodly are somewhat united and help each other, while at other times they are against each other (Luke xxiii. 12; Acts iv. 27).—Ver. 6. CRAMER: The heathen also must bring gold and gifts (Isa. lx. 6), and willingly offer to him in holy attire.

Vers. 9–14. A beautiful emblem of the fact that many among the heathen also shall willingly turn to Christ.—STARKE: God's promises, though it be late, are yet truly and surely fulfilled (Gen. xxv. 23).* If God gives to us, we should also give to Him again. But we give to Him again when we do good to His children and servants.—SCHLIER: How well it would be if all rulers and warlike heroes never had their eye on themselves, but always and only on the honor of the Lord, if all happened to the Lord's honor alone, if all honor were given only to the Lord, if all booty were spent only for the service of the Lord and never for display and pride.

[Ver. 2. David is at the present day often charged with great cruelty for slaying so many of the Moabites; but to most of his contemporaries, friend and foe, it probably seemed a hazardous leniency to spare a full third. The Asiatic rulers have always inclined to what we should regard as extreme severity in punishment; but no man has ever been able to rule long in Asia without such punishments, at least to the extent of making examples, as David did here and in xii. 31. Is there not danger in the Christendom of to-day that we shall go to the opposite extreme, that mercy to criminals will be carried so far as to become cruelty to society?—Ver. 3. Only once, and for a brief season, did the children of Abraham possess the whole region promised to him, Gen. xv. 18. During all the centuries it was theirs by right through God's gift; but it was not theirs by possession through their own fault. In like manner, how seldom does national or individual life and character reach up to the height of its heaven-permitted possibilities.—TR.]

[Vers. 6, 14. I. How trying a life David was leading, in its exertions, hardships, perils. II. How blessed a life amid it all, since the Lord preserved him whithersoever he went!—Vers. 10, 11. It is the lot of many who wish to be greatly useful that they can but gather materials and devise plans, leaving it for others to build and rejoice. Men forget the former class, but God does not. We speak only of Solomon's Temple; but in the eye of God it was David's Temple too. Does one long for a different task, and feel tempted to repine? That which God assigns will be best for us, if we waste not life in dreaming of some other lot, but faithfully stand where He puts us.—TR.]

[Vers. 1–14. *Lessons from David's years of warfare.* 1) A pious man may have many enemies. 2) A pious man may be required to spend much of his life in war. 3) A pious man may be compelled to inflict severe punishments (ver. 2). 4) A pious man, even though not always prospered or preserved (vers. 6, 14) is always guided and blessed. 5) A pious man will rejoice to consecrate the richest results of his struggles and toils unto God (vers. 10, 11).—TR.]

* ["The mills of God grind late the fine flour," say the Jewish Sibylline Oracles; or as a late Greek writer has it, "The mills of the gods grind late, but grind fine."—TR.]

2. David's Internal Government: Organization of the Administration of the Kingdom (VIII. 15–18) and Magnanimous Exhibition of Royal Favor to the Sunken House of Saul.—Mephibosheth. Chapter IX. 1–13.

a. The Administration of the Kingdom and David's Officers. Chap. VIII. 15–18.

15 And David reigned over all Israel, and David executed judgment and justice
16 unto all his people. And Joab the son of Zeruiah was over the host; and Jeho-
17 shaphat the son of Ahilud was recorder; And Zadok the son of Ahitub and Ahi-
melech the son of Abiathar [Abiathar the son of Ahimelech][1] were the priests;
18 and Seraiah[2] was the [*om.* the] scribe; And Benaiah the son of Jehoiada was *over*[3]
both [*om.* both] the Cherethites and the Pelethites; and David's sons were chief
rulers.[4]

b. David's Magnanimity toward Mephibosheth, Jonathan's Son. Chap. IX. 1–13.

1 And David said, Is there yet any that is left of the house of Saul, that I may
2 show him kindness for Jonathan's sake? And there was of the house of Saul a
servant whose name was Ziba. And when they had called [And they called] him
unto David [*ins.* and] the king said unto him, Art thou Ziba? And he said, Thy
3 servant *is he.* And the king said, Is there not yet any of the house of Saul that I
may show the kindness of God unto him? And Ziba said unto the king, Jonathan
hath yet a son [There is yet a son of Jonathan] *which is* [*om.* which is] lame on
4 [in] his feet. And the king said unto him, Where is he? And Ziba said unto
the king, Behold he is in the house of Machir, the son of Ammiel in Lodebar.
5 Then [And] king David sent and fetched him out of the house of Machir, the
6 son of Ammiel, from Lodebar. Now when [And] Mephibosheth[5] the son of Jona-
than the son of Saul was come [came] unto David he fell [and fell] on his face
and did reverence. And David said, Mephibosheth. And he answered [said],
7 Behold thy servant! And David said unto him, Fear not, for I will surely shew
[show] thee kindness for Jonathan thy father's sake, and will restore thee all the
8 land of Saul thy father, and thou shalt eat bread at my table continually. And
he bowed himself and said, What is thy servant, that thou shouldest look upon
such a dead dog as I *am?*
9 Then [And] the king called to Ziba Saul's servant and said unto him, I have

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 17. The supposition that our text has here inverted the names seems to be justified by the whole history, which shows no other priest in David's time by the side of Zadok but Abiathar, the son of Ahimelech. Some, however (Bp. Patrick, Wordsworth), suppose that the chief-priest Abiathar is not here named, but the two subordinate priests are given. This is possible, but not probable, because we have here a list of the chief officers of David. With our Heb. text are 1 Chron. xviii. 16; 1 Chron. xxiv. 3, 6. Sept., Vulg., Chald., while Syr. and Arab. have the inversion here proposed. Erdmann unnecessarily supposes a historical error in the text.—Lit.: "were priests," the Art. being omitted because they were the only priests (high-priests), as above "recorder" and below "scribe."—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 17. It seems impossible to decide certainly between this form of the name and those of Chron. (Shavsha), 2 Sam. xx. 25 (Sheya and Sheva) and 1 Kings iv. 3 (Shisha).—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 18. The Prep. "over" (עַל) is here properly supplied by Eng. A. V., which, however, incorrectly renders the following וְ (which is to be rejected) by "both."—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 18. So Chron.; others render: "counsellors." For the renderings of the verb (כהן) in the ancient versions and lexicons, see Gesen., *Thes. s. v.* Gesenius himself holds that all other meanings of the word are derived from the notion of "priest;" but while the radical meaning must be held to be obscure, the connection of the use of the noun undoubtedly favors the rendering of Eng. A. V. here, and in 2 Sam. xx. 23–26 and 1 Kings iv. 2–6. The verb in Isa. lxi. 10 also presents difficulty.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 6. On the form of this name, in which the last element was originally *Baal*, and the reason for the change see on 2 Sam. iv. 4.—Tr.]

10 given unto thy master's son all that pertained to Saul and to all his house. Thou
therefore [And thou] and thy sons and thy servants shall till the land for him,
and thou shalt bring in *the fruits* that thy master's son may have food [bring thy
master's son food][6] to eat; but [and] Mephibosheth thy master's son shall eat
bread alway at my table. Now [And] Ziba had fifteen sons and twenty servants.
11 Then said Ziba [And Ziba said] unto the king, According to all that my lord the
king hath commanded his servant so shall thy servant do. As for Mephibosheth,
12 *said the king*,[7] he shall eat at my table as one of the king's sons. And Mephibo-
sheth had a young son whose name was Micha. And all that dwelt in the house
13 of Ziba were servants unto Mephibosheth. So [And] Mephibosheth dwelt in Jeru-
salem; for he did eat continually at the king's table; and [*ins.* he] was lame on
[in] both his feet.

[6] [Ver. 10. So all the ancient VSS. except Chald.; the הָיָה of the Heb. is therefore to be omitted as destroying the syntax, since there is now no object for the verb "bring" (Eng. A. V. inserts "the fruits"). Further, some Greek VSS. cited in Montfaucon's ed. of Origen's *Hexapla* read: "and thou shalt bring bread to the *house* (בית instead of בן) of thy lord," and this reading has also been proposed by Böttcher (independently, it would seem, as he does not mention the Greek) and approved by Thenius. The external evidence is distinctly against this reading (it is found only in some anonymous Greek versions), but the internal evidence strongly favors it; for, as Böttcher remarks, the following clause, affirming that Mephibosheth will eat at the royal table, would naturally contrast him with some other person or persons in this clause. The passage would then read thus: "thou and thy sons and thy servants shall till the land for him, and thou shalt bring food to the household of thy master, and they shall eat; and Mephibosheth [himself] shall eat at my table." We might then put אָכַל for אָכְלוֹ, but it is not necessary, since בית (house) may take a verb in the Sing. The change of בית to בן in copying would be easy, especially as the phrase: "son of thy master," is found near, and the error, if it be an error, must have come in very early.—On the other hand our present Heb. text (בן) is favored by the similar phrase elsewhere used in this narrative, and the contrast above referred to, while natural, cannot be said to be absolutely necessary. Böttcher's emendation may therefore be said to be highly probable, but not absolutely certain.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 11. This phrase is supplied by Eng. A. V. on the supposition that these are the words of David, and so Bp. Patrick. Erdmann and others refer the words to Ziba. But it is not probable that David would here repeat his former declaration after Ziba had assented to everything; and in Ziba's mouth the words are inappropriate, whether he means his own table (Philippson), or quotes the king's phrase: "my table" (Erdmann). It is better to regard the phrase as the statement of the narrator. *Bib. Com.*, taking it so, retains the present text and renders: "so Mephibosheth ate at my table," *etc.*, regarding David himself as the narrator, which, however, is hard and unexampled. Following Sept. and Syr. we might read. "and Mephibosheth ate (= was eating) at the king's table," *etc.* The word king (המלך) may have fallen out through error of eye on account of its occurrence at the end of the verse, or the "my table" may have been repeated from ver. 11. To this emendation it is not a sufficient objection that the same phrase would thus be employed by the narrator in ver. 13; for in ver. 11 it describes the conclusion of the immediate arrangement made by the king, while in ver. 13 it concludes the whole account of Mephibosheth's position and circumstances, as for a similar reason the statement about his lameness is repeated in ver. 13.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

a. Chap. viii. 15–18. *The internal administration of the kingdom.* Alongside of David's military activity without is here placed the new summary view of the offices and their incumbents, whereby a unitary administration, embracing all the internal affairs of the kingdom was carried on.

Ver. 15. To David's wars, which gained him safety from enemies and dominion over Israel is here attached a general characterization of his government in its inward nature. **He was executing**, that is, striving in all things thoroughly to establish **judgment and justice in the whole nation.**—According to this point of view he ordered and administered the affairs of the kingdom through the following offices, the names of the incumbents of which are given.—Ver. 16. 1) **Joab was over the host,** had the supreme command of the army, was Minister of war and Chief Marshal in one. See ii. 18. 2) **Jehoshaphat son of Ahilud** (Ahilud was a well-known man) was *Mazkir* (מַזְכִּיר), that is, not the recorder and preserver of the most important events of the kingdom, as Vulg. (*a commentariis*) and Sept. (ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων [keeper of the records]) understand it, but the referee in all internal affairs and highest representative counsellor, **the Chancellor**, who at the same time suggested and drew up the royal decrees and saw to their proper publication and registration in the State-archives. Comp. Œhler in *Herzog*. VIII. 15. [For further mention of this office see 1 Ki. iv. 3; 2 Ki. xviii. 18, 37; 2 Chr. xxxiv. 8. It is evident that the office was a very important one; and from the etymology (the word = one who calls to remembrance) it seems not unlikely that it included the recording of important events. It would thus sufficiently differ from that of Sopher (Scribe or Secretary), which would be more personal and political. Gesenius and others refer to the Roman *Magister memoriæ* and the Persian *Waka Nuwis* (imperial historiographer). In the absence of any English term exactly representing the Hebrew, the "recorder" of Eng. A. V. may be retained.—Tr.].—Ver. 17. **Zadok the son of Ahitub and Ahimelech the son of Abiathar were priests** (= high-priests). Zadok here appears for the first time; he therefore did not become high-priest till after David's accession

to the throne. Through his father, Ahitub, he was a descendant of Aaron's son *Eleazar* (1 Chr. v. 29 compared with 34 and 1 Chr. vi. 35–37); Ahimelech on the contrary descended through Abiathar from *Ithamar*, Aaron's younger son, 1 Chr. xxiv. 3, 6. The "Abimelech" in 1 Chron. xviii. 16 is an error of copyist, since we have "Ahimelech" also in 1 Chron. xxiv. 3, 6. Elsewhere, however, the two high-priests in David's time are given as Zadok and *Abiathar* (xv. 24, 35; xvii. 15; xix. 12; xx. 25), and according to 1 Sam. xxii. 20, Abiathar was a son of *Ahimelech*. Movers, Thenius, Ewald, hence suppose an inversion of names here, so that we should read: Abiathar, son of Ahimelech. But in that case we should have to suppose a similar inversion, so far as regards the change of Ahimelech to Abiathar in 1 Chron. xxiv. 3, 6, 31, passages quite independent of ours, where Ahimelech, as son of Abiathar appears as high-priest of Ithamar's line alongside of Zadok, who is of Eleazar's line. Instead of this violent procedure Bertheau (on 1 Chron. xviii. 16), Œhler, Keil, and others, suggest that Abiathar, son of Ahimelech, had a son of the same name as his grandfather, and that he, for some reason unknown to us, acted as high-priest along with his father who was still living at the beginning of Solomon's reign (1 Kings ii. 27). That he *might* have had such a son of proper age is to be presumed from 1 Sam. xiv. 3. According to xv. 27; xvii. 17, 20, Abiathar had a younger son Jonathan, who afterwards joined Adonijah against Solomon [1 Kings i. 42], while Ahimelech is mentioned neither there nor here, perhaps because he was no longer alive. But this suggestion is open to grave doubts, not merely because an Ahimelech son of Abiathar appears nowhere but here and in the passages cited from Chron., but especially because elsewhere Zadok and Abiathar appear as the acting priests [=high-priests] under David. There remains the supposition of a *historical error* (instead of an *error of copyist*) in the authority used here and in 1 Chr. xxiv. 3, 6, 31, the author of the original account having reversed the order of the names. [This supposition of Erdmann's seems the most improbable of all here cited; error in such a point can hardly be supposed in the author of "Samuel," with 1 Sam. xxii. and the rest of the history before him. An error in copying easily perpetuates itself, though we cannot always explain how it arose, and how it comes to reappear in certain places and not in others.—Still less probable is the opinion of Geiger (*Urschrift*, p. 21) and Wellhausen that there are here traces of a systematic attempt to exalt the line of Eleazar (Zadokites) at the expense of the house of Ithamar; that an "Ahitub" should occur several times is not strange or suspicious, and the whole tone of the history is quiet and natural, showing no signs of distortion and tendentious manipulation. There seems to be no sound objection to supposing an inversion of these names here by a scribe's error. See "Text. and Gram."—Tr.].—Zadok acted as high-priest in Gibeon (1 Chron. xvi. 39; comp. 1 Kings iii. 4) at the Sanctuary, the other in Jerusalem.—4) **Seraiah was scribe** (*Sopher*), State Secretary, not a military muster-officer, for this is designated by another word (פָּקַד), see xxiv. 2, 4, 9. Comp. Œhler (*Herz.* VIII. 15) and Keil. [So in 2 Kings xxv. 19 a certain military officer is termed "the scribe (sopher), the captain of the army, who levied the people," or, perhaps (as in margin of Eng. A. V.) "the scribe of the captain of the army." It is possible that the Sopher combined civil and military duties; it has also been supposed (though there is no proof of it) that there were two officers called Sopher, one civil and military (as here), the other ecclesiastical.—Tr.].—The name of this man in 1 Chron. xviii. 16 is *Sharsha*, in 2 Sam. xx. 25 *Sheya* [Eng. A. V. has the marginal (Qeri) *Sheva*] and in 1 Kings iv. 3 (where the same person is meant) *Shisha*. According to this, Sheya* seems to be a shortened form of Shisha = Shavsha, and the latter, along with Seraiah, a second name of the same person. Possibly, however, the difference came from scribal error or indistinctness of letters, whichever was the original form.—Ver. 18. 5) **Benaiah the son of Jehoiada** (a mighty warrior of Kabzeel, xxiii. 20–23) **was over the Cherethites and the Pelethites** (we are to read "over" instead of the unintelligible masoretic "and," as in the parallel passage in Chron.). These two names designate the *royal body-guard* attached to the king's court and person (Jos. Ant. 7, 5, 4 σωματοφύλακες). The name *Cherethite* is to be derived from a verb (כָּרַת) meaning "to cut down, destroy," it having been the duty of royal guards in the East to execute the death-sentence; so did Benaiah in 1 Kings ii. 25. *Pelethites*, from a verb (פָּלַת), "to hasten, flee," means "runners," the men of the body-guard having had to carry the royal orders swiftly to distant places. Comp. 2 Chron. xxx. 6. In the parallel passage 2 Sam. xx. 23 instead of *Kerethi* [Cherethi] stands *Kari* (from כּוּר, "to dig"), and in 2 Kings xi. 4, 19, for the whole phrase stands: "the *Kari* and the *runners*;" that is, Pelethites = runners. So Gesen. (*Thes. s. v.*), Then. (here and on 1 Kings i. 38; 2 Kings xi. 12) and Keil (here and on Chron.). The words are adjectives (formed by ׳) with substantival meaning, designating offices, properly "executioners and runners" (as the שָׁלִישׁ in xxiii. 8 [Eng. A. V. "captains"]). Comp. Ew., § 177, 164.—Opposed to this explanation is another, first advanced by Lakenmacher (*observ. philolog.* II. 11 seq.), and then defended by Ew., Berth., Mov., Hitzig, Starke, Rütschi and others, namely, that the Kerethi = Cretes or Carians (כרי), and the Pelethi = Philistines, since the latter are called Kerethi in 1 Sam. xxx. 14; Zeph. ii. 5; Ezek. xxv. 16. But in the first passage the name designates not the Philistines in general, but a branch of the Philistine people settled in the southwest of Philistia, and in the two prophetic passages the name "Philistines" stands along with this name (Kerethi), which characterizes them as murderers, exterminators. Further, the view that *Pelethi* is corrupted from *Philistines* (פְּלֵתִי from פְּלִשְׁתִּים) is to be rejected as "wholly without foundation" (so Keil after

---

* שְׁיָא shortened from שִׁישָׁא — שַׁוְשָׁא, the latter, along with שְׂרָיָה, a second name of the same person.

Gesen.: "who can endure such a contraction in a Shemitic language?"). If Kerethi and Pelethi both mean Philistines, the application of two synonymous words to the royal body-guard is as strange as if one should combine "Englishmen and Britons, Italians and Welshmen"* (Gesen.). Against this view, moreover, is the later designation "Kari and runners," whence Pelethi = runners. Besides, the conjecture that the Philistines immigrated from Crete rests on the indefinite statements of Tacitus (*Hist.* 5, 1, 2): "they say that the Jews fled from the island of Crete, and settled in the extreme parts of Libya," and of Stephanus of Byzantium (*s. v.* Γαζά) that this city [Gaza] was once called Minoa after Minos king of Crete, to which are opposed Deut. ii. 23; Am. ix. 7, which state that the Philistines came from Caphtor. See Keil, *Comm.* 266 A. 1 [Eng. transl., p. 368 Note]. Further, as Thenius remarks, "it is altogther improbable that the patriotic David, so faithful to the service of the one true God, should have surrounded himself with a *foreign* and *heathen* body guard," to which Keil (*ubi supra*) admirably adds against Hitzig: "Least of all would David have chosen his body-guard out of the Philistines, the hereditary enemies of Israel."—[The ancient versions throw little light on these words. Sept. and Vulg. transfer them; Syriac has "nobles and rustics (Lond. Polyg. soldiers)," Chald. "archers and slingers."—There are strong reasons for holding them to be not appellatives (as Ges. and Erdm.) but gentile nouns: 1) the grammatical form of the words (Krethi, Plethi) points to this; the termination *i* is used in Heb. to form patronymics and gentilics, and besides to form nouns only from other nouns (sub. or adj.) or adverbs, that is, in general it forms denominative nouns; it cannot, then, be here well referred to verbal roots, as Gesenius and others wish, but must form a denominative, which here cannot well be anything but a gentilic noun; the *shalishi* of 2 Sam. xxiii. 8, cited by Erdmann, being a denominative, does not favor his view; 2) in 1 Sam. xxx. 14 one of these words, Krethi, actually denotes a Philistine tribe, or a tribe dwelling near Philistia; this establishes the fact that it was the name of a tribe, while of any other use there is no established trace in the Bible; for so also it is used in Ezek. xxv. 16 and Zeph. ii. 5, where there is no reason to hold that anything else than the gentilic sense is meant, Ezekiel simply making a play on the name, as is very common in the prophetic writings; 3) add to this that if these words were appellatives signifying "executioners and runners," it is not easy to see why the common Heb. words for these offices were not employed, and why our words appear only in David's time (Rüetschi).—These reasons seem almost decisive for regarding these as proper names (without saying anything of their origin and signification).—The objections urged against this view by Keil and Erdmann seem insufficient to set it aside: *a*) the objection from synonymous names rests on the assumption that both words must be taken as = Philistines; but, as Erdmann himself remarks, the Krethi are only a tribe living in or near the Philistine territory, and the Plethi may be another different tribe or family possibly not Philistines at all; *b*) it is thought that the later phrase "the kari and the runners" (2 Kings xi. 4, 19) establishes the fact that *plethi* = "runners," and that one of our words being an appellative, the other also must be appellative; but that the common Heb. word for "runners or footmen" should be used in Athaliah's time (as in Saul's, 1 Sam. xxii. 17, and of Absalom and Adonijah) cannot prove that David did not have a special body of guards with a special gentilic name, even supposing the phrase in 1 Kings xi. to be parallel with ours, which is by no means certain; if the Plethi were runners, it does not follow that the word itself means "runners;" nor is it clear whether the Kari (Eng. A. V. incorrectly "captains") are the same with the Krethi (in 2 Sam. xx. 23 the text has Kari, the margin Krethi), rather the word is another proper name (Carians or some other); *c*) David's patriotism and piety would be no bar to his taking a body-guard from neighboring tribes, among whom he had probably passed a part of his time of exile, and had many friends (compare Uriah, Ittai, and other foreigners), nor were such men necessarily heathen because they were foreigners, many foreigners having attached themselves to the religion of Israel.—As to the origin of the names Krethi and Plethi there is much uncertainty. The first is identified with *Cretan* by those that think Caphtor (Gen. x. 14, Deut. ii. 23) to be Crete, but against this Ebers has brought strong reasons (*Ægypt.* I. 130 sq.); however, independently of any reference to Caphtor, a tribe may have come from Crete and settled on the Mediterranean shore. The connection of Kari with Carian, while not improbable in itself, is yet unproved. The identification of the second name Plethi with Plishti or Philistine (by the falling out of the *s* letter) is hard and improbable; Bp. Patrick thinks it likely that the name designated an Israelitish family, and refers to the Reubenite Peleth, Num. xvi. 1, and the Judahite of the same name, 1 Chr. ii. 33; Abarbanel (cited and approved by Philippson) regards both words as names of Israelitish families. At present we must be content to remain in ignorance of the origin of the names.—Tr.]* 6) **And David's sons were confidential counsellors.** As Movers (*Bibl. Chron.* 302 sq.) has shown, the word *cohen* [usually = priest] does not here mean "domestic chaplains, palace-priests, unlevitical spiritual advisers" (Gesen., De Wette, Winer, Maurer, and others), but "confidential counsellor," according to 1 Kings iv. 5, where the same term applied to Sabud, son of Nathan [Eng. A. V. "principal officer"] is explained by the phrase "the king's friend." [This phrase is not necessarily an *explanation* of the term *cohen*, but may be simply another descriptive epithet.—Tr.]. The periphrastic expression in 1 Chr. xviii. 17 "the first [chief] at the hand (side) of the king" points to the same signification. According to Kimchi the verb (כִּהֵן) means "to serve in an office of dignity;" according to Grotius, "to *do*

* [The word *welsh* means "foreign," and the Germans applied the name to Italians, as the Saxons did to the Cymry.—Tr.]

* [Böttcher omits these two words, and (after the Sept.), renders "Benaiah was counsellor," introducing יֹעֵץ instead of "Krethi and Pelethi;" but this view has little in its favor.—Tr.]

service, whence the participle in reference to God means a *priest*, in reference to the king a *minister*." [This seems to be the most probable statement from the examples in the Old Test., the rendering of Sept., Syr. and Chald. here, and the opinion of the Talmud (Bab., Nedarim 62 a) and the rabbinical writers. The fullest discussions are by J. D. Michaelis, *Supplem. in Lex. Heb.*, and Gesenius, *Thes. s. v.* Our data are hardly sufficient to enable us to speak with certainty of the original meaning of the word.—Tr.]

The list of officers (vers. 16–18) is here appended to the statistical-historical account of David's wars in order to conclude the history of David's royal rule at its culmination with a glance at the internal administration of the kingdom. It can no more be conclusively decided from this that the Editor here incorporates into his account a [different] history of David (Thenius) than in the similar passage, 1 Sam. xiv. It is a list of the high officers of state that stood by him in the internal administration of the kingdom at the moment when he had secured it against "the enemies roundabout," and extended it by victories over them, and could now undisturbed give attention to its internal strengthening and organization. The list in xx. 23–26, on the contrary, gives the list of officers as it stood in his last days after the internal shocks that his government had sustained.

b. Ch. ix. *David's magnanimous conduct towards Mephibosheth.* As Mephibosheth was five years old at Saul's death (iv. 4), and now had a young son (v. 12). what is here related cannot be put immediately after David's removal to Jerusalem or Ishbosheth's murder (ch. iv.) (as Then. would do on account of David's words, "is there left any of Saul's house?" which might indeed have been spoken with reference to that murder), but belongs to a later period, when David had secured his kingdom within and raised it to its zenith by external wars. These words indicate that David after long wars was had now found a time of quiet to attend to internal affairs, among the most important of which must have been the fulfilment of his covenant of friendship with Jonathan. The narrative shows how he fulfilled Jonathan's request (1 Sam. xx. 15), and his own answering promise with royal grace and magnanimity.

Ver. 1. David's question: **Is it so that there is yet any one left to* Saul's house?** presupposes that he had made inquiry and gotten information thereof, and now wished to assure himself of what he had heard. He had perhaps some time before accidentally heard of the concealed abode of the unfortunate last scion of Saul's house in a remote place (ver. 5). The words: **That I may show him kindness for Jonathan's sake** refer to Jonathan's words, 1 Sam. xx. 14, 15 ("show me the mercy of the Lord," *etc.*).†—Ver. 2. A former servant of Saul, *Ziba*, gives exacter information of the person and the place. [Kitto in *Daily Bib. Ill.* thinks it improbable that David knew any thing of the existence of a son of Jonathan, or that he would recognize him under his altered name (Mephibosheth instead of Meribbaal); Ziba was probably known to some of David's officers and hunted up by them. —Tr.] In David's question to him (ver. 3): **Is there no one, *etc.*, that I may show him the mercy of God?** the term *mercy* or *kindness* (ver. 1) is more exactly defined as a kindness such as God Himself shows; and this agrees again with Jonathan's mention (1 Sam. xx. 14) of the "kindness of God," which he begs David to show to him and his house. [Others understand it of kindness in God, out of reverence for God, for God's sake (Keil), or take the expression as merely a superlative one = very great kindness (Patrick), others combine these three views, and this is better; kindness shown from an indwelling in God will be pure and great kindness such as God shows.—Tr.] According to Ziba's information [vers. 3, 4] **Jonathan's lame son is in Lodebar in the house of Machir the son of Ammiel.** — *Lodebar* (לוֹ דְבָר, in xvii. 27 לֹא דְבָר) was therefore across the Jordan near Mahanaim and Rabbath-Ammon, perhaps Lidbir,* Josh. xiii. 26. According to this account *Machir* was a respected and propertied man, who had taken charge of Mephibosheth after Jonathan's death. [See chap. xvii. 27–29.—Tr.]

Vers. 6–8. *Meeting of David and Mephibosheth.* —Mephibosheth does reverence to David as his king with such tokens of fear that David is obliged to encourage him: **Fear not.**— It was oriental custom that rulers, and especially those of a new dynasty, should slay all the relations of a predecessor. David relieves him of this fear by declaring: 1) that he would show him kindness for his father Jonathan's sake; 2) would restore to him all Saul's land—that is, his private estate at Gibeah (comp. 1 Sam. ix.), which had passed into the possession either of David or of remote kinsmen of Saul (Mephibosheth had therefore hitherto been a poor man, dependent on others), and 3) would take him during his life into his house and to his table. **Thou shalt eat bread at my table continually.**—Mephibosheth, overwhelmed by this exhibition of royal grace, testifies his gratitude by *gestures* ("bowed himself") and by words wherein he confesses himself unworthy of such great goodness. The comparison of the *dead dog* indicates what is lowest and most despicable, comp. 1 Sam. xxiv. 15. [Grove (Art. "Mephibosheth" in Smith's *Bible Dictionary*): These early misfortunes [loss of parents, lameness, poverty] threw a shade over his whole life, and his personal deformity seems to have exercised a depressing and depreciatory influence on his character.—Tr.]

Vers. 9–13. *Mephibosheth put in possession of Saul's estate and admitted to David's house and table.*—David's transaction with Ziba suggests that the latter resided at Gibeah, on the land of Saul's family, and stood in some relation to the family, perhaps that of steward. David 1) *informs* him that he has restored to Mephibosheth all the property of Saul and of his house. **I have given them to thy master's son**—*son* here=*grandson*, as above (ver. 7) *father*=*grandfather*; 2) *commissions* him (ver. 10) to cultivate the land for

* The Dat. is not periphrasis of the Gen. (Keil), nor to be changed into "from (מִן), the house" (Then.), but indicates "appertainment to."

† [On this speech of Jonathan see the corrected Eng. translation and translator's notes.—Tr.]

* [This word לִדְבִר is variously read and understood; Eng. A. V. Debir.—Tr.]

him, entrusts him with the management and control of the property. The "*bring*" is to be understood of "*storing* into the barns or also of *delivery* at Jerusalem" (Thenius), the latter according to Josephus and Ewald, § 303 *c*. **That the son of thy master may have bread and eat it** refers not to Mephibosheth's son (Micha ver. 12), as has been supposed in order to avoid the apparent contradiction of David's statement that Mephibosheth is to eat at his table; there is really no contradiction, since this last statement merely means that Mephibosheth *himself* is to have the honor of daily eating at David's table, while these words relate to the general support of the house and family of the so highly honored son of David's friend. [On the text see "Text. and Gramm."—Tr.] The statement: **Ziba had 15 sons and 20 servants** serves to explain the commission: **Cultivate the land thou and thy sons and thy servants** and to show that Ziba was in condition with his family and servants to manage so large an estate. "Something considerable could therefore be made for Mephibosheth" (Thenius). Ver. 11 in its two parts—Ziba's declaration that he would perform David's command, and the statement of Mephibosheth eating at David's table—corresponds to the two parts of ver. 10. The words: **And Mephibosheth eats at my table as one of the king's sons** cannot be taken as David's (Clericus, De Wette [Eng. A. V.]), since David would then have said the same thing three times, and there would in general be no reason for such a *reply* to Ziba's words. They are rather to be regarded as spoken by *Ziba*—not, however, as a *rejoinder* in the sense: "If he will live with me, he will be treated as a king's son" (Grotius), but as a *repetition* of David's word, attached to the "as my lord has *commanded*" (ver. 10) with the expression of joyful astonishment and the consequent addition: "as one of the king's sons!" Ziba, in affirming that all that the king has ordered shall be done, repeats in reference to Mephibosheth his *verba ipsissima*. This explanation may be preferred to the assumption of a wrong reading here, namely, "my table," for "David's table," Sept. (Thenius, Keil), or "thy tables" (= thy table, Böttcher), partly because the text is not to be altered without pressing necessity, partly because in that case the statement that Mephisbosheth ate at David's table would be repeated immediately afterwards (in ver. 13). [For another view of the text see "Text. and Gramm." —Tr.]

Ver. 12. [Mephibosheth was about 13 years old when David fixed his abode in Jerusalem; how old he was now would depend on the chronological position of chap. ix., which cannot be fixed with certainty. The Heb. word (קָטָן) here rendered "young" is indefinite as to age; for Micha's descendants see 1 Chron. viii. 34 sq.; ix. 40 sq.—Tr.] "The house of Ziba were *servants;* Vulg. "served." Thenius, in view of ver. 10, would read the Particp. serving (עֹבְדִים). In any case, the constant servitude of Ziba's whole household to Mephibosheth is indicated, while the latter as lord of the land dwelt at Jerusalem as companion of David's family in the house and at the table.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The picture of David's royal power and glory in contrast with the poor, crippled son of Jonathan, the last scion of Saul's fallen house, comes out in greater splendor, the deeper the latter humbles himself before him and trusts himself to his favor. In his noble conduct to Mephibosheth David demonstrates the friendship that he had sworn to Jonathan.

2. The truly pious and God-fearing man not only shows "kindness of God" in so far as God's kindness impels him to show such merciful love as God does, whereby he proves himself in truth a child of God, but it is the merciful love of God Himself that dwells in his heart and works therefrom; for he that lives in fellowship with God receives into his heart through the Holy Ghost the love that is in God, and lives and moves in this love.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[Chap. viii. 15–18. Taylor: In the minds of most readers of the Bible the name of David, king of Israel, is associated mainly with military prowess, poetic genius, and personal piety; and only on the rarest occasions do we hear any reference made to his administrative ability. Yet in this last quality he was at least as remarkable as in any one of the others; and great injustice is done to him if we leave out of view the eminent services which he rendered to his country by the exercise of his governmental and organizing faculties.... More than Charlemagne did for Europe, or Alfred for England, David accomplished for the tribes of Israel.—Tr.]

Chap. ix. How true, compassionate love of one's neighbor should be exhibited, is shown by David's conduct towards Mephibosheth. 1) This love does not suffer the neighbor's need to come to it, but searches out and goes after the need; 2) It does not suffer itself to be determined by selfish aims, but does its duty in faithfulness and impelled by God's mercy for God's sake; 3) It brings to the neighbor's heart, when filled with trembling anxiety and fear, consolation and peace by the words, "Fear not;" 4) It lifts up the neighbor from his wretchedness and want, by restoring to him what he had lost without fault, and by making him share in the enjoyment of its own blessings, assigned it by God.

How a man after God's heart, amid experiences of divine goodness and faithfulness, should show the mercy of God towards his fellow-man: 1) By faithfully discharging the duties of *friendship;* 2) In case there has been *enmity*, by requiting evil with good; 3) By rendering to one on whom God's counsel has inflicted *misfortune*, the words and deeds of humble and helpful love.

The exercise of merciful love is an evidence that one has himself experienced the divine mercy; for this mercy is, 1) Its source, 2) Its motive, 3) Its example.—"The mercy of God is that which is shown in God and for God's sake, Luke vi. 30." (Berl. Bible.)

Ver. 1. Starke: To poor children whose parents have deserved well of us we should do good in return. Wuert. Bib.: When harm has been

done one, and his enemy is no longer present, he should not avenge himself on his posterity, but should forget the wrong, and, if possible, should do good to the children and posterity of the man who wronged him (Matt. v. 44).—[HENRY: David had too long forgotten his obligations to Jonathan, but now, at length, they are brought to his mind. It is good sometimes to bethink ourselves whether there be any promises or engagements that we have neglected to make good; better do it late than never. SCOTT: Those who have much in their power should sedulously *inquire* after opportunities of doing good; for frequently the most deserving objects of our compassion are concealed by modesty and patient resignation.—TR.]—Vers. 2, 3. S. SCHMID: All our good works, even works of mercy, must be done for God's sake.—STARKE: Our mercy should be ordered according to God's mercy.

Ver. 5. STARKE: A Christian should not only love in word, but also in deed and in truth (1 John iii. 18).—Ver. 6, 7. CRAMER: Treat orphans as a father, and thou shalt be as a son of the Most High (Ecclus. iv. 10).—WUERT. BIBLE: When parents are pious, their children after their death enjoy the fruit of it (Exod. xx. 6; Ps. cxii. 1, 2).—Ver. 7. BERL. BIBLE: Believers should earnestly take care to show all possible loving service to the children of those whom they have loved in the Lord, since we can then do nothing better than to remind such children of their parents' grace, that they may follow them in faith and piety.—SCHLIER: Still is it a good thing for children if they have God-fearing parents, and still for long years may children enjoy the good their parents have done. The piety of parents is worth more than much money and goods.—[COWPER:

My boast is not that I deduce my birth
From loins enthroned, and rulers of the earth;
But higher far my proud pretensions rise—
The son of parents passed into the skies.—TR.]

Ver. 9. HALL: There is no more certain way to glory and advancement than a lowly dejection of ourselves. Vers. 11, 12. OSIANDER: Stewards should serve their lord not with eye-service, but with all fidelity (Eph. vi. 6; Col. iii. 22).

IV. *The Ammonite-Syrian War.*

CHAPTER X. 1–19.

1 AND it came to pass after this that the king[1] of the children of Ammon died,
2 and Hanun his son reigned in his stead. Then said David [And David said], I
will show kindness unto Hanun the son of Nahash, as his father showed kindness
unto me. And David sent to comfort him by the hand of his servants for his
father. And David's servants came into the land of the children of Ammon.
3 And the princes of the children of Ammon said unto Hanun their lord, Thinkest[2]
thou that David doth honour thy father that he hath sent comforters unto thee?
hath not David *rather* [*om.* rather] sent his servants unto thee to search the city[3]
4 and to spy it out and to overthrow it? Wherefore [And] Hanun took David's
servants, and shaved off the one half of their beards, and cut off their garments in
5 the middle *even* [*om.* even] to their buttocks and sent them away. When [And]
they told it unto David[4] [*ins.* and] he sent to meet them, because [for] the men
were greatly ashamed; and the king said, Tarry at Jericho until your beards be
grown, and *then* return.
6 And when [*om.* when] the children of Ammon saw that they stank [that they
had made themselves loathsome[5]] before David [*ins.* and], the children of Ammon
sent and hired the Syrians of Beth-rehob and the Syrians of Zobah, twenty thou-

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. The reason for the omission of the king's name here (in the Heb. and all the VSS.) is not obvious; yet there is no good ground for supplying it. The Arab. vers. omits the name of the son also in this verse.

[2] [Ver. 3. Lit.: "is David an honorer of thy father in thy eyes, that?" *etc.*

[3] Ver. 3. Some MSS. and edd. of the Heb., and the Arab. have "land" instead of "city," which, as being the easier rendering, is here less probable.

[4] [Ver. 5. Chron. has: "and they went and told David concerning the men," which is an expansion for the sake of clearness.

[5] [Ver. 6. Syr. Arab., Vulg., Sym. and Chald. render: "that they had injured David," which does not point to a different text, but is an explanation. Instead of בדוד Sept. read (as in the Heb. of Chron.) עם דוד, which is rendered by them "the people of David" (עָם).

sand footmen, and of king Maacah [and the king of Maacah] a thousand men, and
7 of Ish-tob [and the men of Tob], twelve thousand men. And when [*om.* when]
David heard of it, he [and] sent Joab and all the host of [*om.* of], the mighty men.
8 And the children of Ammon came out and put the battle in array at the entering
in [the doorway] of the gate; and the Syrians of Zoba and of Rehob and Ish-tob
9 [the men of Tob] and Maacah were by themselves in the field. When [And] Joab
saw that the front of the battle was against him before and behind [*ins.* and], he
chose of all the choice men of Israel, and put *them*[6] in array against the Syrians;
10 And the rest of the people he delivered into the hand of Abishai his brother that
11 he might put [and put] *them* in array against the children of Ammon. And he
said, If the Syrians be too strong for me, then thou shalt help me, but [and] if the
children of Ammon be too strong for thee, then I will come and [to] help thee.
12 Be of good courage, and let us play the men [Be strong, and let us show ourselves
strong[7]] for our people and for the cities of our God; and the Lord [Jehovah will]
13 do[8] that which seemeth him good. And Joab drew nigh, and the people that were
14 with him, unto the battle against the Syrians, and they fled before him. And when
[*om.* when] the children of Ammon saw that the Syrians were fled, then fled they
also [and they fled] before Abishai, and entered into the city. So [And] Joab
returned from the children of Ammon and came to Jerusalem.
15 And when [*om.* when] the Syrians saw that they were smitten before Israel [*ins.*
16 and], they gathered themselves together. And Hadarezer[9] sent and brought out
the Syrians that were beyond the river; and they came to Helam,[10] and Shobach
17 the captain of the host of Hadarezer *went* before them [was at their head]. And
when [*om.* when] it was told David [*ins.* and], he gathered all Israel together and
passed over [*ins.* the] Jordan and came to Helam. And the Syrians set them-
18 selves in array against David and fought with him. And the Syrians fled
before Israel, and David slew *the men of* seven hundred chariots of the Syrians and
forty thousand horsemen [of the S. seven hundred chariot-men and four thousand
horsemen], and smote Shobach the captain of their host who [so that he] died there.
19 And when [*om.* when] all the kings that were servants to Hadarezer saw that they
were smitten before Israel [*ins.* and], they made peace[11] with Israel and served them.
So [And] the Syrians feared to help the children of Ammon any more.

6 [Ver. 9. Philippson renders: "put himself," and so below (ver. 10) "he put himself," but this seems less natural than the usual translation.—Tr.]

7 [Ver. 12. It is better here to preserve the identity of the Heb. word rendered "strong," which is used in several places in the context.—Tr.]

8 [Ver. 12. The form here is future, not optative (Vulg.), though it is possible that the final ה is repeated from the following word.—Tr.]

9 [Ver. 16. Here also there is wavering in the Heb. MSS. as to the spelling of this name, some MSS. and edd. having "Hadadezer;" see on x. 3.—Tr.]

10 [Ver. 16. For the discussion of this reading see the Exposition. So on ver. 18.—Tr.]

11 [Ver. 19. Sept. renders "fled to" (ηὐτομόλησαν), a free translation; so probably Vulg. As to the addition in the Vulg. (see Exposition) Böttcher would put it at the beginning of ver. 16. It is perhaps better to regard it as a marginal remark made on some copy of the Vulg., though it is not easy to account for the number given, fifty-eight thousand. Its absence from the other versions justifies us in excluding it from the text.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Compare the parallel narrative in 1 Chron. xix.—Vers. 1–5. *The cause of the war with the Ammonites.* This war, having been only mentioned in viii. 12, is here, together with the Syrian wars occasioned by it (given fully in ch. viii.), described in its whole course, because of its close connection with the history of Uriah and his wife, which became for David the fatal point at which his kingdom turned from glory to downfall.—Ver. 1. **And it came to pass after this.** On this loose, general formula of connection see viii. 1. **The king of the children of Ammon died.**—His name (which is inserted in Chron.* by way of explanation) is not mentioned till ver. 2; this *Nahash* is the same as he of 1 Sam. xi. 1. [As this was probably about forty years after the events narrated in 1 Sam. xi., it is possible, certainly, that the two kings Nahash may be the same; but it is neither certain nor very probable, considering the usual length of royal reigns.—Tr.] — Ver. 2. What kindness Nahash had shown David is unknown. Perhaps he had sent congratulations on his accession to the throne. At all events his relations with David were friendly, while with Saul his relations were hostile.* For his defeat at Jabesh see 1 Sam. xi.—[Some refer to 2 Sam. xvii. 25 as possibly indicating a family-alliance between David and Nahash.—Tr.] David accordingly sent an embassy of condolence to *Hanun* the son of Nahash.—Ver. 3. After the death of Nahash,

* [The German here has incorrectly "the Septuagint," instead of "Chronicles."—Tr.]

* [Bp. Patrick suggests that he was friendly to David because hostile to Saul.—Tr.]

who was in friendly connection with David, the Ammonite princes, jealous no doubt of the mighty growth of the kingdom of Israel, introduce a new era by counselling his successor to adopt a hostile policy that would be a challenge to war.—**Is David in thine eyes an honorer of thy father** (which question involves a negation)? The question itself contains a slight reproach against the king, that he allowed himself to be deceived by David's conduct. They express to him the suspicion that David sent this ostensibly consolatory embassy merely for the purpose of spying out and then destroying the "city," that is, Rabbah (1 Sam. xi. 1), the capital-city of the country. Rabbah was a strongly fortified place (comp. ver. 14), the internal examination of which was certainly important for an enemy purposing to besiege it.—Ver. 4. The king, treating the ambassadors as spies, subjected them to the indignity of shaving off the *half* (that is, one side) *of their beards*. This is the grossest insult that can be offered an Oriental; for the beard is the sign of the free man's dignity and his finest adornment. Isa. vii. 20; l. 6.* See Lakemacher, *Observ.* X. 145 sq., Arvieux, *Nachricht.* III. 173, Niebuhr, *Beschreib. v. Arab.*, 317, and farther in Winer, *s. v. Bart.*—[Keil, Philippson and others quote modern instances. Many Orientals would rather die than lose their beards, and the Turks used to regard beardless Europeans as runaway slaves. A war like this occurred in Persia in 1764.—Tr.] Hanun besides cut off the long outer garments of the ambassadors **to the buttocks**.† The Israelites, except the priests, wore no breeches. So much the grosser, therefore, was the insult.—Ver. 5. After hearing of the double insult offered his ambassadors, David directs them not to return, but to stay at Jericho and wait for their beards to grow.

Vers. 6–14. *Israel's successful war* against the *Syrians*, whom the Ammonites had hired (vers. 6–13), and against the *Ammonites*, who after the flight of their allies, likewise took to flight (ver. 14).—Ver. 6. The Ammonites desired war with Israel. They knew that by their treatment of the ambassadors of David they had made themselves *stinking*, that is, hateful to him (1 Sam. xiii. 4), and *hired as allies:* 1) the Syrians of *Beth-Rehob;* comp. ver. 8,‡ where we have simply the name Rehob. This Rehob is the name of the Syrian district, whose capital-city was Beth-Rehob. This is hardly to be sought where Robinson (*Neue bibl. Forschung.*, p. 488 [Am. ed. III. 371, 372]) conjecturally locates it, namely, in the ruins of the fortress Hunin, southwest of the Tell el Kadi (the old Laish-Dan), the northern boundary of Palestine, since in that case the capital-city of this Aramæan region would have lain within the land of Israel (Keil); it is better located [twenty-five Eng. miles] north-east of Damascus, on the site of the present Ruhaibeh (Kremer, *Dam.*, p. 192, Ritter XVII. 1472, Stähelin, 56), unless, following the reading in Chron. (*Naharaim* for Beth-Rehob), we prefer the *Rehoboth of the river*, that is, of the Euphrates (Gen. xxxvi. 37), where there is now (near the junction of the Chaboras and the Euphrates) a place called Er-rahabeh or *Rahabeh* (Rosenm., *Alterth.* II. 2, 270 sq.; Ritter XV. 128), where this city may have been situated. Keil's argument against this view, namely, that the sway of the king of Zobah (ver. 16) extended beyond the Euphrates into Mesopotamia, and hence this "Rehoboth on the river" cannot well have been the capital-city of a particular Aramæan kingdom, is not of force, partly because this sway is by no means certainly proved, partly because it is not made out that it embraced the *whole* territory between the two rivers. [See Arts. *Rehob* and *Rehoboth* in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*—Tr.]—2) The Syrians of *Zobah*, see viii. 3. 3) The king of *Maachah* (in Chron. Aram-Maachah), bordering on Geshur, according to Josh. xii. 5 on the northern border of Bashan, on the south-western declivity of Hermon (comp. Onom. Μαχαθί), on the border of the Israelitish trans-jordanic territory (Deut. iii. 14), especially of Reuben and Gad (Josh. xiii. 11). 4) Not Istob (as in the VSS., Joseph., Ew., § 273 *b*), but the men of *Tob*, since there was a region of this name near the Ammonite territory, to which Jephthah fled (Judg. xi. 5). Its location cannot be fixed with certainty. Ewald: the *Thauba* (Θαῦβα) of Ptol. 5, 19, which, however, must be sought for in desert Arabia. Knobel: the present *Tubneh*, about twenty-four Eng. miles south of Damascus, comp. *Tubion* (Τούβιον,* Τουβίν), 1 Macc. v. 13; 2 Macc. xii. 17. Stähelin: the present village *Taibeh*, mentioned by Ritter XV. 891, 922, and placed north of Tibneh in Wetzstein's map of Hauran. Chron. gives exacter information: Hanun sent one thousand talents of silver to hire from Aram-Naharaim, Aram-Maachah and Zobah chariots and horsemen. For this large sum (over two million dollars) the Ammonites, according to Chron., hired him thirty-two thousand chariots and horsemen† (רֶכֶב, comp. viii. 4) *and* the king of Maachah with his people. Chron. states that the hired auxiliaries encamped at *Medeba* (comp. Josh. xiii. 9, 16, with Num. xxi. 30), the present Medaba, four Eng. miles south-east of Heshbon, between the Arnon and the Jabbok opposite Jericho, in the territory of Reuben; it afterwards came into the possession of Moab, Isa. xv. 2.—[It is mentioned in the inscription of the Moabite king Mesha as having been captured by Omri, and recaptured by Mesha.—Tr.] The ruins, situated on a hill, are a mile in circuit. See Raumer, 264. As it was in a plain (Josh. xiii. 16), not more than eight miles southwest of Rabbah, the strong Ammonitish capital-city, it was a suitable rendezvous for the hired auxiliaries and a good position for the defence of Rabbah against a siege. The auxiliaries of Tob are not mentioned in Chron. The two accounts [Sam. and Chron.] agree in the number of the auxiliaries.

* [Lev. xix. 27; Deut. xiv. 1 are not in point here; they refer not to ordinary shaving, but to idolatrous clipping of the hair. Comp. the Nasarite-vow.—Tr.]

† For שֵׁת — *nates* Chron. has the euphemistic מִפְשָׂעָה — step, that is, the part of the body where stepping is made possible, since the legs there begin.

‡ [The Germ. has ch. viii., where the name Rehob is used of a king (vers. 3, 12), but not of a district.—Tr.]

* [In 1 Macc. v. 13 Tischendorf writes Τώβιον, Tobion.—Tr.]

† [The word in Chron. means "chariots" only, and does not include horsemen.—Tr.]

According to Chron. the Ammonites hired thirty-two thousand men [Chron. says "chariots."—Tr.] *and* the troops of Maachah; Sam. gives one thousand from Maachah, two thousand from Zobah, and twelve thousand from Tob. But as to the composition of the auxiliary troops, the two accounts differ; according to the Chronicler there were "chariots and horsemen," according to our passage "footmen," while yet according to viii. 4 and 1 Chron. xviii. 4 the king of Zobah fought against David with "chariots and horsemen." Keil: "Here, then, there are copyists' errors in both texts. For the Syrian troops consisted neither of infantry alone, nor of chariots and horsemen alone, but of infantry, cavalry and war-chariots, as is evident not only from viii. 4; 1 Chron. xviii. 4, but also from the close of our narrative.—The Syrians fought in both battles with all three arms, so that David twice defeated chariots, cavalry and infantry."

Ver. 7. Against these hostile troops David sends his general Joab and the "whole host, the mighty men." Not "the whole host *of the warriors*" (De Wette), but "Gibborim" [mighty men] is in apposition with "the whole host." The mention of the *whole* army excludes the supposition of a select body, "a foundation of the Israelitish army" (Bunsen), especially as the Gibborim are never distinguished from the whole army (Bertheau on 1 Chron. xix. 8). There is therefore no ground for supplying "and" before "the mighty men" (Thenius). [Eng. A. V. incorrectly inserts "of."—Tr.]

Ver. 8. **And the Ammonites came out**, that is, from their capital city, where they had gathered within the protecting fortifications. This appears from the following words: **and put themselves in battle-array before the gate of the city**, that is, Rabbah (so in Chron. "before the city"). The position of the Syrian auxiliaries "*in the field*," that is, on the broad plain of Medeba, is clearly distinguished from that of the Ammonites before the city (for defence or attack), so that the statement of the position of Joab's army (ver. 9) is clear. It is not said: "And when Joab saw that the *battle* was against him" (De Wette), but: "that the face (front) of the battle was against him, in front and in rear." He could be attacked on both sides, by the Ammonites in rear, by the Syrians in front. He therefore so makes his dispositions as to *select some from all the chosen* men in Israel.* This chosen body Joab sets against the Syrians, their position in the open field making their attack sharper (perhaps, also, they were the more numerous), while the Ammonites stood in reserve to cover their stronghold Rabbah.—The rest of the army (ver. 10) he placed under the command of his brother *Abishai* against the Ammonites, in order that he might be covered in rear in his attack on the Syrians, and might have support, if he needed it.—To this refers his agreement with Abishai in ver. 11. Either was to come to the help of the other, if there was danger of being overpowered by the enemy. It hence appears that the Israelites were not to make an assault on both sides at the same time, but Joab intended first to attack and defeat the Syrians, while Abishai was to cover his rear. A simultaneous attack might, however, be made by the two armies between which Joab and Abishai stood. The point here, therefore, was quickly and stoutly to carry through a bold stroke.—This is the reference in Joab's words to Abishai in ver. 12, of which Thenius finely remarks: "This is a warlike exhortation, the briefest indeed, but the fullest of meaning." **Be stout**, strong—this applies to Abishai personally and indicates stout *temper of mind*—**and let us show ourselves stout**—this refers to warlike *action;* **for our people and the cities of our God**—with these words he points out the prize for which they were contending. The weal and freedom of the whole Israelitish *people* was at stake. "*The cities of our God;*" these words mean either the cities of Israel in general, which as representatives of the whole land are called the cities *of God*, because they are with the whole land *God's property and possession* (Keil), or those cities in which the worship of the living God was established for the whole people, whose conquest by the enemy would have resulted in the overthrow of the worship of Jehovah and the establishment of the heathen worship of idols. [Others suppose, not so well, that the reference here is to Medeba and other cities now threatened by the enemy, though still in the hands of the Israelites.—Tr.]. **The Lord will do what is good in his eyes**; these words express *trust in God* combined with unconditional submission. Alongside of the *faithfulness* (to be shown by bravery and firmness), that was to do its duty in this situation so dangerous for the people and for Jehovah, is put the hidden *will of God* in respect to what will happen, and unconditional submission to His counsel and deed. The sense is well expressed by Clericus: "If it should seem good to God to give our enemies the victory, we must acquiesce in His will; meantime let us go bravely into battle."—Ver. 13. Quickly and vigorously the attack is made on the *Syrians*—they *flee*. Grotius: "as often happens with those that fight for pay alone without respect to the cause." [So Bp. Patrick.—Tr.]. "Inasmuch as for them, casually assembled, there would be neither glory in victory nor shame in flight," *Tacit. Hist.* II. 12. [Perhaps Joab first attacked the Syrians not solely because they were mercenaries and in the open field, but also because they were better disciplined and therefore more to be feared than the Ammonites.—Tr.]. —Ver. 14. This rout of the allied force occasioned the flight of the *Ammonites* also, who threw themselves into their *capital city*. After this brilliant exploit Joab brought the campaign to an end and returned to Jerusalem, probably because (see xi. 1) the advanced season was unfavorable to carrying through the siege of Rabbah [or also, because the Syrians were not sufficiently broken, or because he had not the materials for a siege (*Bib. Com.*).—Tr.]

Vers. 15–19. *Second battle with the Syrians* and their complete defeat under Hadarezer.—Ver. 15. The ground of the Syrians for again collecting their forces was shame at having been defeated by the Israelites, and care for their safety against a presumable campaign of David. Among the Sy-

* Chron. has the Sing. (בָּחוּר), which is a more common designation of the army than the Plu. The בְּ ("in") before "Israel" is to be retained (against the VSS. and some MSS.).

rians king Hadarezer of *Zobah* (viii. 3) appears as the most powerful prince and David's most hostile opponent. Here and in Chron. he is always called Hadarezer, in chap. viii. Hadadezer. The Syrians (reassembled after their rout) are reinforced by the Syrian troops that Hadarezer (ver. 16) called to his help "from beyond the river," that is, from Mesopotamia. These Mesopotamians levied by him were, therefore, under his jurisdiction (comp. ver. 19). *Shobach*, Hadarezer's field-marshal, led these troops, but was also general-in-chief of the whole Syrian army (ver. 18). **And came to Helam.**—The Hebrew might also be translated: "and their army came" (Then., Böttcher). But the remark would be somewhat superfluous and excessively dragging in this militarily lively and curt account. As there is no such remark in Chron., and as in ver. 17 the phrase "he came to Helamah," designates the place where David met the Syrians, the word is to be taken (with the ancient VSS.) as the name of a place, our word here being merely a shorter form of that in ver. 17 (חֵילָם = חֵלָאם). The place has not yet been identified. [Instead of the second *Helam* Chron. has "to them." If we adopt this text and render "their army" in ver. 16, the account will read: Hadarezer brought the Syrians, and their army came and Shobach before them . . . and David passed over Jordan and came to them, and the Syrians, *etc.* It is not easy to decide between the texts of Sam. and Chron.; the difficulty of identifying Helam may be an argument for both.—Tr.].—Ver. 17. Helam is designated as the place across the Jordan whither David brought his army and fought the Syrians. Chron. has "he came on them" (the Aramæans) —either a scribal error, or an intentional omission of the name of the place because it was too little known. The name *Helam** is thought by Ew., Bött. and Then. to point to the *Alamata* on the Euphrates (Ptol. 5, 15, 25). But the Syrians would hardly have fallen back before David as far as the Euphrates to receive his attack there with the river in their rear. As this is the same battle that (according to 1 Chron. xviii. 3) was fought at *Hamath* (comp. viii. 4), and the statement "came to Helam" here follows immediately *after* the remark that David crossed the Jordan, Helam must be located across the Jordan, not on the Euphrates, but farther west near Hamath. Here the whole Israelitish and Syrian armies stood opposed to one another in battle. [Why David took command in person is not stated; probably on account of the importance of the campaign, hardly from any dissatisfaction with Joab. Some account must be taken of David's military spirit.—Tr.]—Ver. 18. *David's splendid victory.* The Syrians partly took to *flight*, partly were *cut to pieces* by the Israelites. The completeness of the victory is farther especially brought out by mentioning *first* (ver. 18) the large number of the slain: seven hundred chariot-soldiers and forty thousand horsemen (Chron. gives seven thousand† chariot-men and forty thousand footmen). With this the statements in viii. 4 and 1 Chron. xviii. 4, 5 (one thousand seven hundred horsemen, or one thousand chariot-men and seven thousand horsemen, and twenty thousand footmen of Aram-Zobah, and twenty-two thousand men of Aram-Damascus) agree "as well as can be expected in the well-known corruption of numbers, so that there is scarcely a doubt that the number of fallen Aramæans is the same in both accounts (chaps. viii. and x.), and that our chapter relates circumstantially the same war, the result only of which is given in ch. viii. and 1 Chr. xviii." (Keil). It is *then* further stated that David so smote the general that he died; that is, he died on the field of wounds received in battle.—Ver. 19. The result of this defeat: 1) "all the vassal-princes" that had followed Hadarezer's summons to war against David, made peace with Israel when they saw that they were beaten. The addition (after the first "Israel") in the Vulg.: "they feared, and there fled fifty-eight thousand in the presence of Israel," does not warrant us in introducing it into the text (with Thenius), and finding therein the statement of the number of those that were "slain in flight;" for such a numerical statement does not suit the tenor of the narrative, which here intends only a general remark on the recognition of their complete defeat by the Syrians, so that we should least expect such a statement here about merely a part of the defeated army—apart from the fact that the word "smitten" (ver. 19) includes all the slain, not merely those that fell *in flight;* 2) the Syrian princes and peoples became tributary to Israel, and rendered the Ammonites no more aid against the Israelites.—Nothing is here said of the wars with *Damascus* and *Edom*, to which Joab turned in the south (ch. viii.), while David was gaining his victories in the north, because the narrative is here occupied with the fortunes of Rabbah only because of their connection with those of Uriah (Ewald).

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. One injustice produces another, and drags men on irretardably to destruction by the resulting chain of sins and injustices. The king of Ammon with sinful levity lends his ear to the liars and calumniators that surround him; thence comes the most outrageous insolence towards David's ambassadors, and the most abusive insult to the whole people of Israel; on this follows the hasty preparation and provocation of a wholly unjust, wicked war; therein the princes are forced to take part, and so to stake their land and people. The end is complete destruction.

2. This great danger, prepared for David by his enemies, was made through the divine control to conduce to the magnifying of his name, and to his ascent to the highest point of royal glory. The bold insolence of the enemies of God's people and kingdom must serve not only to bring about more wonderfully the revelation of the Lord's power in subduing enemies and helping friends, but also to manifest more splendidly the glory and might of His kingdom in the battles into which it is forced by enemies.

3. Joab's word to Abishai is a prelude to the Lord's word to Peter: "Strengthen thy brethren."

* חֶלְאָמָה, "Heb. name of a Syrian city, dual-form from חַיִל (two armies), with the ה־ local" (Böttcher).

† [This number is almost incredibly large, and the text of Sam. is to be preferred.—Tr.]

Heroic bravery in the war (it exhorts) is to be combined 1) with the *recognition* of those most sacred *possessions and ends* for which the struggle is to be made,—thereby it is consecrated,—and 2) with humble, trustful *submission* to the *will of the Lord*—thereby it is preserved from temerity and presumptuousness. The war is a just and holy one, undertaken for the defence of the possessions received from God, to guard the honor of God, and in the name of God.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 12. *Bravery in battling for the highest objects:* 1) It is *rooted* in *fidelity* to God and to our brethren the *people* of God; 2) It is *proven* by *devotion* of body and soul and the whole life to the aims of the *kingdom* of God; 3) It is *sanctified* by unconditional *submission* to the purposes and doings of the *will* of God.

"*The Lord do that which seemeth him good:*" 1) A confession of humble *submission* to God's will, in presence of the greatest perils referring everything to Him; 2) A testimony borne by childlike and strong *reliance* on the Lord's *help*, which is confidently expected in the cause of His people and His kingdom; 3) The expression of a *devout frame of mind*, which is the basis of all *genuine fidelity* in fulfilling the duties of one's calling, and especially of all true *bravery* in fighting against the enemies of God's kingdom.

Vers. 1 sqq. CRAMER: Nothing worthier can be devised than to requite thanks with thanks. Prov. xvii. 13.—SEB. SCHMID: When God will chastise a people, He withdraws from them good and sensible rulers; and woe to the land whose king is a child (Eccl. x. 16).—Ver. 3. SEB. SCHMID: Calumny is a diabolical vice, since under appearance of prudence and truth it calls forth the greatest misfortunes.—STARKE: To put an evil construction upon good is the best art of the ungodly.—[HALL: Carnal men are wont to measure another's foot by their own last; their own falsehood makes them unjustly suspicious of others. . . . It is hard for a wicked heart to think well of any other; because it can think none better than itself, and knows itself evil. The freer a man is from vice himself, the more charitable he uses to be unto others.—TR.]

Ver. 6. CRAMER: That is the way with an evil conscience; it flees before it is hunted (Job xv. 20).—J. LANGE: When a man knows that he has deserved punishment, and yet is unwilling to acknowledge his guilt, he is sure to heap upon himself more and more guilt.—[HALL: It is one of the mad principles of wickedness, that it is a weakness to relent, and rather to die than yield. Even ill causes, once undertaken, must be upheld, although with blood; whereas the gracious heart, finding his own mistaking, doth not only remit of an ungrounded displeasure, but studies to be revenged of itself, and to give satisfaction to the offended.—TR.]

Ver. 12. STARKE: A Christian must indeed show all diligence in his calling and station, but must look to God for whatever progress he wishes to make (1 Cor. iii. 6).—[HALL: The tongue of a commander fights more than his hand. A good leader must, out of his own abundance, put life and spirits into all others: if a lion lead sheep into the field, there is hope of victory. . . . All valor is cowardice to that which is built upon religion.—HENRY: "God and our country" was the word. . . . When we make conscience of doing our duty, we may with the greatest satisfaction leave the event with God; not thinking that our valor bids Him to prosper us, but that still He may do as He pleases, yet hoping for His salvation in His own way and time.—TR.]. Vers. 13 sq. OSIANDER: Those who rely on man and do not trust God, come to shame (Psa. xxv. 3).—[HENRY: Joab provided for the worst, and put the case that the Syrians or Ammonites might prove too strong for him (ver. 11); but he proved too strong for them both. We do not hinder our successes by preparing for disappointment.—TR.]

Vers. 15–19. SCHLIER: He who does evil will also reap a harvest of evil; and he who helps in evil will certainly also get a poor reward from it. As the seed, so the harvest.—The Lord has everything in His hand, then He has the insolence of enemies in His hand and makes all work well. He can check and subdue even the greatest insolence, and convert it into a blessing for His people.

[Vers. 3, 4. They who are tempted to offer gross insults had always better look before they leap.—Ver. 5. "*Tarry at Jericho,*" *etc.* 1) We must beware of casting pearls before swine (ver. 2. The Ammonites must have been known to David as a cruel and barbarous people). 2) Nothing is so offensive as a wanton insult, in return for respect and kindness. 3) The gravest men are sensitive to ridicule of their personal appearance. 4) All persons of noble nature are considerate of the feelings of others. 5) Time heals many ills.—Ver. 12. Joab was a selfish, unscrupulous, unprincipled man; yet in entering upon a perilous battle he talks piously. So do almost all generals and civil rulers in any great emergency; not only because they know that the people feel their dependence on God, but because in the hour of trial they feel it themselves. Such language under such circumstances does not clearly prove one to be devout, or to be hypocritical; it expresses a feeling which may be genuine, though transient and superficial.—TR.]

SECOND SECTION.

The beglooming of David's royal rule by the sins of himself and his house, and the thence resulting misfortunes.

CHAPS. XI.—XVIII.

I. *Internal shattering of David's rule by the grievous sins of himself and his house.*

CHAPS. XI.—XIV.

1. David's deep fall during the war against Rabbath-Ammon. Chap. xi. 1–27.

1 AND it came to pass, after the year was expired, at the time when kings[1] go forth
to battle, that David sent Joab and his servants with him, and all Israel; and they
destroyed the children of Ammon, and besieged Rabbah. But [And] David tar-
2 ried still at [abode in] Jerusalem. And it came to pass in an eveningtide, that
David arose from off his bed and walked upon the roof of the king's house; and
from the roof he saw a woman washing herself, and the woman was very beautiful
3 to look upon. And David sent and enquired after the woman. And one said, Is
4 not this Bath-sheba, the daughter of Eliam, the wife of Uriah the Hittite? And
David sent messengers and took her, and she came in unto him, and he lay with
her;[2] for [and] she was purified from her uncleanness, and she returned unto her
5 house. And the woman conceived, and sent and told David, and said, I am with
child.

6 And David sent to Joab, *saying*, Send me Uriah the Hittite. And Joab sent
7 Uriah[3] to David. And when Uriah was come [And Uriah came] unto him,[4] [*ins.*
and] David demanded [asked] *of him* [*om.* of him] how Joab did, and how the peo-
8 ple did, and how the war prospered. And David said to Uriah, Go down to thy
house, and wash thy feet. And Uriah departed [went] out of the king's house,
9 and there followed him a mess[5] *of meat* [*food*] from the king. But [And] Uriah

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. So the Qeri (margin). Böttcher and Hitzig retain the Kethib "messengers," the former understanding it of ambassadors, the latter of watchers to observe the new moon (comp. Jer. xxxi. 6); but these views are not probable; it is not likely that a time of the year would be defined by an act that was performed twelve times a year, and it is unlikely that ambassadors were sent out at a special time of the year. Though the Kethibh (מלאכים) may be the harder, and so far the preferable form, general considerations strongly favor the Qeri.—Böttcher's theory is that there existed two recensions of the history, one made by priests (which he marks PR.), the other by laymen (LR), of which the former is here followed by "Chronicles" (making Joab act independently, and softening the "Ammonites" into the "land of Ammon"), and the latter by "Samuel" (emphasizing the king's activity, *etc.*). Rather we should say that the author of "Samuel" selected his material from a *prophetical* point of view, the author of "Chronicles" from a *Levitical* point of view.—TR.]

[2] [Ver. 4. Wellhausen rightly observes that the Athnach should be under עִמָּהּ, and the purification will then be subsequent and not previous (as in the following "for" of Eng. A. V.) to the time of וַיִּשְׁכַּב.—TR.]

[3] [Ver. 6. After "Uriah" one MS. of De Rossi, Syr., Chald., insert "the Hittite," an instance of the tendency to assimilation.—The omission of the לֵאמֹר ("saying") makes no difficulty here (so also in xix. 15); it is easily supplied in thought, and is inserted by Sept., Vulg., Arab. (as in Eng. A. V.). Böttcher thinks that the omission belongs to the curt priest-text, the insertion to the lay-text.—TR.]

[4] [Ver. 7. Some MSS. of Kennicott and De Rossi, and Syr., Arab., Vulg., read "to David," an illustration of the disposition of copyists and translators to make the text clearer by stating the person or thing explicitly rather than trust to the frequently indefinite Pronoun. In general, the preference is in such cases to be given to the less explicit.—TR.]

[5] [Ver. 8. "Or, a portion, gift," literally "something lifted up" (Sept. ἄρσις). Vulg. and Chald. render *food* and *meal*, Syr. and Arab. *gift*. Some anonymous Greek VSS. (in Montfaucon's Hex.) have a strange rendering: ὀπίσω ἀυτῶν παρεστηκότων τῷ βασιλεῖ "after those that stood by the king" (reading τῶν for ἀυτῶν), as if Uriah were preceded by royal officers, from whom David may have learned (ver. 10) that Uriah did not go home. Schleusner suggests that they read מְשָׁרֵת (minister) instead of מַשְׂאֵת.—TR.]

slept at the door of the king's house with all[6] the servants of his lord, and went not
10 down to his house. And when they had told [And they told] David, saying, Uriah
went not down to his house, [*ins.* and] David said unto Uriah, Camest thou not from
thy journey? [Art thou not come from a journey?] why *then* [*om.* then] didst thou
11 not go down unto thine house? And Uriah said unto David, The ark, and Israel,
and Judah abide in tents [booths]; and my lord Joab and the servants of my lord
are encamped in the open fields [field]; shall I then [and shall I] go into mine
house to eat and to drink and to lie with my wife? as thou livest[7] and as thy soul
12 liveth, I will not do this thing. And David said to Uriah, Tarry here to-day also,
and to-morrow I will let thee depart. So [And] Uriah abode in Jerusalem that
13 day and the morrow. And when David had [And David] called him [*ins.* and]
he did eat and drink before him, and he made him drunk; and at even he went
out to lie on his bed with the servants of his lord, but [and] went not down to his
house.

14 And it came to pass in the morning that David wrote a letter to Joab, and sent
15 it by the hand of Uriah. And he wrote in the letter, saying, Set[8] ye Uriah in the
forefront of the hottest battle, and retire ye from him, that he may be smitten and
16 die. And it came to pass, when Joab observed the city, that he assigned Uriah
17 unto a place where he knew that valiant men were. And the men of the city went
out and fought with Joab; and there fell some of the people of the servants of Da-
18 vid; and Uriah the Hittite died also. Then [And] Joab sent and told David all
19 the things concerning the war; And charged the messenger, saying, When thou
hast made an end of telling the matters of [all the things concerning] the war unto
20 the king, And[9] if so be that the king's wrath arise, and he say unto thee, Wherefore
approached ye so nigh unto the city when ye did fight [to fight]? Knew ye not
21 that they would shoot from the wall? Who smote Abimelech the son of Jerubbe-
sheth[10]? did not a woman cast a piece of a millstone upon him from the wall, that
he died in Thebez? why went ye nigh the wall? then say thou, Thy servant Uriah
the Hittite is dead also.

22 So [And] the messenger went, and came and showed David all that Joab had
23 sent him for. And the messenger said unto David, Surely [*om.* surely] the men
prevailed against us, and came out unto us into the field, and we were upon them

[6] [Ver. 9. The omission of the word "all" in Sept. and Arab. (Vulg. has *cum aliis servis*) has simplicity in its favor; it would be natural to insert here a descriptive word.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 11. The Heb. text is here supported by all the versions except Sept., which has: πῶς; ζῇ ἡ ψυχή σου, "how? as thy soul liveth," that is, it read הֵיךְ "how?" (see Dan. x. 17) instead of חֵיךָ. On account of the seeming tautology of the Heb., Thenius and Böttcher adopt the reading of the Sept. (in which, however, the *how?* is intolerable, while Wellhausen would read חֵי יְהוָה "by the life of Jahveh," or strike out the second clause: "by the life of thy soul." But this double asseveration may easily be understood as the repetition of an excited soldier.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 15. הָבוּ; Sept. εἰσάγαγε "bring in" = הָבֵא, but the Sing. here does not agree with the following Plu. שַׁבְתֶּם (so Wellhausen).—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 20. The Sept. repeats in ver. 22 the whole of the speech (with one or two verbal alterations) that Joab puts into David's mouth in vers. 20, 21. On the other hand the Heb. text says nothing of David's anger, nor of any such speech, when the messenger reports to him (ver. 23 sq.). Böttcher, therefore, rejecting the "monstrous repetition" of the Sept., holds that the speech in question belongs (with an introductory "and David was wroth with Joab") at the end of ver. 22, that it was afterwards inserted after ver. 19, because it seemed necessary there, the Sept. translating from a text that contained the repetition, while the masoretic text dropped the second speech as cumbersome. So also (as to the form of the text) substantially Thenius, who omits ver. 21 as far as the second "wall." The latter, however, thinks the alleged omission in the Heb. (at the end of ver. 22) to have been purposely made by the transcriber, in order to conceal his recognized error of insertion in vers. 21, 22; Wellh., on the contrary, holds that the omission was for brevity's sake simply.—Joab's speech, as it stands in the Heb., certainly shows a very lively anticipation of David's view of the case: but Böttcher is wrong in saying that such anticipation is impossible, for Joab of course puts it only as a supposition, and Abimelech's case would naturally occur to him. There is no need on this account merely to suppose that David actually got angry, or cited Abimelech's history; Joab's lively anticipation does not logically involve David's conformity to it. But, if David did show anger, there is still no necessity for supposing that he mentioned Abimelech, and his objection to approaching the wall might easily have been taken for granted and omitted.—Then, it is after all more probable that the Sept. should make so natural an insertion than that the Heb. text should omit it. We, therefore, with Erdmann, retain the masoretic text.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 21. Sept. *Jerubbaal*, the original form of the name; but probably *Jerubbesheth* (so Böttcher) is the correct text-reading here, this form having become common in the time of the author of our Book. The Sept.-translator went back to the original form. This does not offer support to Böttcher's hypothesis of the two recensions of our text (priestly and laic).—The Sept. also calls Jerubbaal the son of *Ner*, which Thenius thinks is for *Zer*, the last syllable of Abiezer (see Judg. vi. 11). It may, however, be worthy of notice that the Syriac has "Abimelech the son of Nedubbeel" (for *Ner*ubbeel), substituting the Syr. *n* of the 3 sing.-masc. Impf. for the Heb. Yod; and there may be some connection between this and the Sept.-form.—Tr.]

24 even [*om.* even] unto the entering [doorway] of the gate. And the shooters shot
from off the wall upon thy servants; and some of the king's servants be dead [died],
25 and thy servant Uriah the Hittite is dead also. Then [And] David said unto the
messenger, Thus shalt thou say unto Joab, Let not this thing displease thee, for the
sword devoureth one as well as another; make thy battle more [*om.* more] strong
26 against the city and overthrow it. And encourage thou him. And when [*om.*
when] the wife of Uriah heard that Uriah her husband was dead, [*ins.* and] she
27 mourned for her husband. And when [*om.* when] the mourning was past [over],
[*ins.* and] David sent and fetched her to his house, and she became his wife, and
bare him a son. But [And] the thing that David had done displeased the Lord
[Jehovah].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. The siege of Rabbah. Comp. 1 Chron. xx. 1. **And it came to pass at the return of the year**—that is, at the setting in of spring* in the month of Abib (Nisan), with which the new year began. Josephus: "as the Spring set in." [Comp. our *March* from the god of war, Mars, the beginning of the old Roman year.—Tr.] The *term. a quo* referred to in this chronological statement is the time (x. 13, 14) when Joab, having driven the Aramæans off, and the Ammonites having retired before Abishai into their capital city, had returned to Jerusalem on account of the rain in winter, which made it unwise to begin a siege. **At the time when kings go forth.**—Instead of the "messengers" of the Heb. text, read "kings" (Qeri), as in all the versions and in Chronicles. A reference to the embassy of chap. x. 2, after all the intervening events, would here be completely out of place. The "kings" here, however, are not the hostile kings (chap. x.) that came out against David (Maurer)—against which is the preceding chronological statement, and the absence of any reference to the past events recorded in chap. x.—but the Israelitish kings. On the return of the season favorable to military operations, when the kings of Israel were accustomed to go forth to their wars, David advanced to the siege of Rabbah, which he had deferred the year before on account of the unfavorable season. [Joab had no doubt taken precautions to guard against hostile movements of the enemy.—Tr.] **And David sent Joab and his servants with him and all Israel**—that is, the military chieftains from about his person and his court (comp. ver. 9) and the whole army, including soldiers and officers. The "servants" are not the war-servants proper in distinction from a militia serving only in time of war (Mich.)—an entirely arbitrary distinction—nor the "officers" in distinction from "all Israel" as the *army* (Thenius). **And they destroyed the children of Ammon.**—Chron.: "the land of the children of Ammon." But the verb is elsewhere used (as in 1 Sam. xxvi. 15) of persons in reference to the land inhabited by them. It is unnecessary to regard "land" as more correctly used here in contrast with the capital city (Thenius), because it was usual, while some strong point was attacked to ravage the land far and near by incursion-parties; so 1 Sam. xiii. 16, 17. [Our text, as the harder, is to be preferred; Chron. has introduced a natural explanation.—Tr.] **And they besieged Rabbah** = "Rabbath of the children of Ammon,"—that is, the great city of the Ammonites. See Josh. xiii. 25; Deut. iii. 11; the present ruins of Rabbat-Amman on the Nahr-Amman (the upper Jabbok), perfectly desert and uninhabited. Polybius: Rabbathamana. **But David remained in Jerusalem** [the impending war with the Ammonites alone not being of sufficient importance to require his presence—Tr.]—explanatory transition to the episode of David's adultery.

Vers. 2–5. *David's adultery with Bathsheba.*—This section and the following one are wanting in Chronicles. **Towards the evening** [Heb.: in the evening—Tr.]—when the noon-rest was over, and the cooler part of the day had come. [In later times the evening (עֶרֶב) began at three o'clock in the afternoon; it was the time when it was getting darker, when the sun was declining, and after sunset till dark.—Tr.] **David was walking** (for pleasure) **on the roof of the king's house**, which was built on the edge of Mount Zion, so that one could thence look immediately down into the courts of the Lower City, where Uriah's house was,* comp. ver. 8. The woman that David saw was in the act of bathing (the Heb. uses the participle) in the uncovered court of her house, where, in accordance with general Eastern custom, there was a well. [Or, in her chamber, the casements being open (Patrick). In either case, the place was private, visible only from a neighboring roof; and in the East people refrain from looking down from a roof into neighbors' courts (Philippson); so that it is on this ground an unfounded suggestion that Bathsheba was purposely bathing in an exposed place in order to attract the king's gaze.—Tr.]—Ver. 3. Inflamed with sensual desire, David makes inquiry about the woman whose beauty had attracted him. "And one said (Vulg.: *nuntiatum ei est*), Is it not, *etc.?*" That is, "It is, *etc.*" (the negative question is often used in lively discourse). This form of expression supposes that the object or person mentioned was somehow already otherwise known.—Instead of "Bathsheba, daughter of Eliam," 1 Chron. iii. 5 has "Bathshua, daughter of Ammiel." The form *Bathsheba* (= "daughter of the

* [Some interpret: "when the summer set in." Abarbanel: "when the sun returned to the same point." Perhaps the phrase is a general one: "when the year had rolled round, and the time came for kings to go forth."—Tr.]

* [It is not necessary to suppose that David's *siesta* and evening-walk show that he had become inert and luxurious. It was the habit of the times, and he seems to have begun his walk with no evil design.—Tr.]

oath," not "daughter of Sheba") is, according to 1 Ki. i. 11, 15 and other places, to be regarded as the usual, and so as the original and correct, one. The difficulty of explaining it makes it impossible to adduce the meaning in favor of the originality and correctness of the form Bathshua (Thenius), which may easily have come from the other by a copyist's change of a single letter (ב into ו). According to Ewald (§ 273 *d*), *Eliam* and *Ammiel* are different forms of the same name by an arbitrary inversion of the component parts.* [From 2 Sam. xxiii. 34, where Eliam is called the son of Ahithophel, it is supposed by some that Bathsheba was the grand-daughter of Ahithophel, and that this explains the latter's adherence to Absalom. So Jerome, Chandler, p. 407, Note, and Blunt, *Undesigned Coincidences*, p. 143 sq. (Am. ed.). The supposition seems not improbable.—Tr.] *Uriah* was a *Hittite*. He belonged (xxiii. 39) to David's Gibborim [Heroes]. The Hittites already in Palestine in Abraham's time (Gen. xv. 20) dwelt near Hebron (Gen. xxiii. 7 sqq.), afterwards near Bethel (Judg. i. 24 sqq.); Solomon reduced the remnant of them to servitude (1 Ki. ix. 20).—Ver. 4. Short but very vivid narrative of the sinful deed committed by David in spite of his learning that Bathsheba was a married woman. That David used force or artifice to get possession of the "innocent" woman (Mich.) is not indicated in the expression: "and he took her." The narrative leads us to infer that Bathsheba came and submitted herself to David without opposition. This undoubtedly proves her participation in the guilt, though we are not to assume that her bathing there was "purposed," in order to be seen (Thenius). She was moved doubtless by vanity and ambition in not venturing to refuse the demand of David the *king*. Her purification (which was according to the Law, Lev. xv. 18) was performed while she was yet in the king's palace. [Eng. A. V., Philippson and others not so well make the purification precede her coming to the palace, putting a full stop after the word "uncleanness."—Tr.]—Ver. 5. Adultery was, according to Lev. xx. 10, punishable with death. Her message to David had in view the avoidance of the consequences of this sin (Keil).

Vers. 6–13. David's efforts to conceal the adultery frustrated by Uriah.—Ver. 6. There is no evidence that *Uriah* was the armor-bearer of Joab (Josephus). He had a *command* in the army, as is clear from what follows, especially from the questions in ver. 7, which could be answered only by one whose position gave him a wide and exact knowledge of the condition of the war. David brought him to Jerusalem in order that, as Bathsheba's husband, he might hereafter pass for the father of the child begotten in adultery. The *questions* addressed to him were intended to conceal from him as far as possible the purpose for which he was called, and to make the impression that he was summoned to render a military report. Washing the feet is the symbol at the same time of rest and refreshment. After David has dismissed him to his home, he sends him literally "something *taken up*," what the man of rank sets before his guest from his own table (Gen. xliii. 34), and then any present (Am. v. 11; Esth. ii. 18). Here it was probably a dish of honor, which Uriah was to enjoy at home.—Ver. 9. Uriah, however, did not act according to David's will and expectation, but remained in the king's palace "at or in the door," and spent the night there, in the guard-room (1 Kings xiv. 27, 28), with the royal court-officials or the body-guard. It is possible that he did this merely out of zeal of service (comp. ver. 11); but also his suspicions may have been already aroused, and he may have heard something of the affair with Bathsheba.—Ver. 10 sq. [Perhaps David had sent to find out whether Uriah went home, or the servants that carried the present may have informed him.—Tr.] There is a certain tone of displeasure in David's words already, though his question was a natural one, since Uriah's conduct (as indicated in the question) must have been strange. Uriah's answer [ver. 11] is an explanation and justification of his not going home, together with a solemn asseveration; whereby he conceals his real ground of action, his unwillingness to meet the king's wish. According to his statement, the Ark had been carried along into the field,*—for the war was a war of the Lord. When it, the sign of God's presence, and all Israel, God's host, were in *tents*, and Joab and the king's officers were lying on the bare ground, how could he take his pleasure in his house? **By thy life and by the life of thy soul** is not a tautology, but a strengthening of the oath by repetition of the thought, the expression combining the general and the special. [See the text examined in "Text. and Gram." The phrase "Israel and Judah" probably indicates an authorship for our Book after the division of the kingdom; yet not certainly, since there was foundation for the distinction of the two parts in the fact that Judah alone at first adhered to David. See Erdmann's *Introduction*, § 6.—Tr.]—Ver. 12 sqq. This attempt failing, David tries to gain his end by keeping Uriah a day longer. He invited him to his table, and made him drunk, in order thus more certainly to secure his passing the following night with his wife. That night, however, Uriah again slept at the palace-door. A factual irony! David sees his plan wholly frustrated, and is now driven by his sin-entangled, sin-darkened heart to add murder to adultery. [A chronological difficulty is made here unnecessarily by some critics: it is said that the invitation of ver. 13 was given on the "morrow," and this last word is joined to ver. 13 so as to read: "Uriah abode in Jerusalem that day. And on the morrow David called him," *etc.* In that case Uriah did not depart on the morrow, as David promised (ver. 12), since he slept in Jerusalem that night (ver. 13), but the day after the morrow (ver. 14). The difficulty is removed by supposing (as is quite possible) the invitation of ver. 13 to have been given on the

* [That is, the names are composed of *am* = people, and *el* = God. Eliam = God of the people; Ammiel = people of God. For other views see the lexicons of Gesenius and Fürst.—Tr.]

* [Comp. 1 Sam. iv. 4. The ark was taken along as an encouraging sign of the divine presence and favor—probably not to inquire of God (against Patrick and *Bible Comm.*). Such inquiry was made through the high-priest's ephod. In Josh. vii. 6 (the only case of inquiry at the ark mentioned) Joshua had a special divine revelation, as Moses used to have. On 1 Sam. xiv. 18 see the discussion of the text *in loco*. On a rabbinical view that there were two arks, one containing the ephod, see Philippson *in loco*.—Tr.]

"that day" of ver. 12; then the "morrow" of ver. 12 will be identical with the "morning" of ver. 14. The "calling" in ver. 13 does not necessarily require a more definite statement of time than is suggested in ver. 12.—Tr.]

Vers. 14-27. The letter concerning Uriah. Uriah's death. Bathsheba David's wife.—Ver. 14 sqq. Uriah himself must bear the letter that decrees his death. A new artifice of David's that makes murder its minister. Uriah was to be placed in the hottest, most dangerous part of the battle, where a retreat would not be strange, and he, David well knew, as a brave soldier (one of the Gibborim or Heroes) would not so easily retreat. No reason is assigned [in the letter] for this command, which Joab could not misunderstand. He had simply to carry out the royal instructions, and so he did (ver. 16 sqq.). **And it came to pass when Joab watched the city** (such is the literal rendering of the Heb. שְׁמוֹר). "We must understand by this a procedure different from the usual siege, a nearer approach, which challenged the warriors in the city to a sally" (Bunsen) [comp. Judg. i. 24, where the participle of the same Hebrew verb is rendered "spies" in Eng. A. V., properly "the observing (*i. e.*, besieging) force."—Tr.]. Joab knew the place where the enemy's best warriors would fight in the sally. There he put Uriah, whose bravery he knew, without needing to say to the soldiers: "leave him in the lurch" (Michaelis, Bunsen), since he could foresee that this would happen from the dangerousness of the post. In becoming the instrument of David's murderous artifice, Joab needed not to know the ground of the order. As obedient servant of the king he carried it out the more unhesitatingly, inasmuch as it was an order of the commander of the *army* in relation to a soldier, who might have committed some grave offence against him, and whose seemingly accidental death might be desired by him for special reasons.—Ver. 18 sq. *Joab's message.*—From the account of the message it is obvious that the messenger knew nothing of the crafty plot against Uriah's life. It is an elaborate report by Joab of the near approach of a part of the besieging force to the wall of the city, leading to a sally by the enemy, wherein a number of the Israelites fell. To this circumstantial account the report of Uriah's fall (the only part of it now interesting to David) was to be added in a supplementary way at the end. Joab takes it for granted that the king will exhibit anger (pretended or real) at this useless spilling of blood. **Abimelech the son of Jerubbesheth**—*i. e.*, Gideon, Judg. vi. 32.* His death by a mill-stone is related Judg. ix. 53. [*Bible Commentary* here remarks that "this reference to Judg. ix. 53 indicates the existence in David's time of the national annals of that period in an accessible form, and the king's habit of reading or having read to him the history of his country." But Joab's reference to Abimelech shows merely that the facts were known (possibly by tradition), not certainly that national annals existed (though it is not improbable that there were written accounts of such events). It is hardly probable that our Book of Judges existed at this time.—Tr.]—**Say, Thy servant Uriah the Hittite is dead also.**—This the messenger was in any case to say *last*, as an appendix to his report, "as if Uriah, of his own accord, or even against Joab's will, had pressed forward with his men, and so was chargeable with his own death and that of the others that had fallen" (Keil). Joab is evidently concerned to conceal the wicked deed from the messenger, and at the same time to let David know that it is accomplished.

Ver. 22 sq. *David's reception of the messenger.*—The message is delivered exactly in accordance with Joab's instructions.* Between vers. 22 and 23 the Sept. has an insertion [Sept. reads: and David's anger was kindled against Joab, and he said to the messenger, Why did ye approach to the city, *etc.*, inserting nearly through ver. 21.—Tr.] This Thenius adopts on the ground that neither David's presumed displeasure, nor any expression of it on the report of the messenger is mentioned. But this is unnecessary. Either the "kindling" of David's anger, supposed possible by Joab, did not take place—or, if it did, there was no need to relate it at length; it was taken for granted, and the narration gives only the words of the messenger in reply to David's comment on the rash affair, in order to explain and justify it. [The text here is discussed in "Text. and Gramm." and the present Heb. reading defended.—Tr.]

Ver. 23.† The enemy supposed that with their superiority of numbers here they could make a successful sally. This sally led to a hot fight, wherein the Israelites pressed near to the wall within shot of the archers, and thus many were killed. The messenger therefore reports a sally of the besieged, which occasioned this dangerous approach to the wall.‡—Ver. 25. David's answer is, as it were, an extenuation of the matter, and of such nature that the messenger cannot suppose a reference to any thing more than this bloody military affair. **Let not this thing be evil in thy eyes; so and so devours the sword.**§—David's words seemingly express the quiet and equanimity of a commander who does not permit

* [There written *Jerubbaal.* On the change of name see on 2 Sam. ii. 8; ix. 6—and on the Sept. reading see "Text. and Gramm." on this verse.—Tr.]

* שָׁלַח with two Accus.; to send a person with a thing—commission him, 1 Ki. xiv. 6; Isa. lv. 11.

† כִּי—at the time *that, when*, frequently so used in Ex. xxi. (in distinction from the conditional אִם), or *eo quod—because*, fully יַעַן כִּי "for this reason because," comp. Isa. i. 29, 30; Job xxxviii. 20. [Or—ὅτι, *that*, introducing substantive clause (as frequently in N. T.). Thenius unnecessarily objects to this כִּי as "referring to nothing."—Tr.]

‡ The א in יֹּראוּ and מוֹרְאִים [ver. 24] is an Aramaic form.

§ The intrans. יֵרַע with the sign of the Acc. אֵת (as elsewhere the Pass. Verb is found with the Acc.) according to the *sense*, the *active* meaning coming forward against the intrans. and pass. Ew. § 277 *d*. [The אֵת here introduces the Acc. of general limitation.—Tr.] The sense is: Look not evilly on this thing. Comp. 1 Sam. xx. 13; Josh. xxii. 17; Neh. ix. 32. On כָּזֹה וְכָזֶה see Ew. § 105 *b*. The first time *o* is put for *e*, a slight phonetic change easily occurring in such correlative phrases (Judg. xviii. 4; 1 Kings xiv. 5).

himself to be disturbed by such bad news. Thus he conceals his excitement over the success of his plot. He orders the siege of Rabbah to be pressed and the city to be destroyed. The messenger is dismissed with this answer to Joab, with the further instruction: strengthen him, encourage him. Neither the isolated position of these words, nor David's encouraging the field-commander by a messenger, makes this expression a strange one (Thenius); for we need not suppose the "*messenger*" so far below "his *general*" in rank as to make such an exhortation in the *king's* message necessarily unbecoming. The "messenger" was certainly not a common soldier, but doubtless a high officer who, as his words show, had knowledge of the whole conduct of the war before Rabbah. The Sept., Syriac and Arabic translate: get possession of it, namely, the city, comp. 1 Kings xvi. 22. These words would then form the conclusion of the message. [Comp. also Jer. xx. 7. But this sense of the verb cannot be established from the biblical usage. It means to *press on* one (Jerem. xx. 7), to *prevail against* (of persons, 1 Kings xvi. 22), but apparently not to conquer a city. Another objection to this rendering is that it would introduce an anti-climax: "destroy it and prevail against it." On the other hand, the signification *encourage* is well established, Deut. i. 38; Isa. xli. 7.—Tr.]

Vers. 26, 27. Bathsheba David's wife. The usual mourning lasted seven days (comp. 1 Sam. xxxi. 13). Bathsheba was probably taken to wife by David immediately after the expiration of this time of mourning. If the mourning-time of widows was no longer than the ordinary mourning, then the interval between the adultery and the marriage was doubtless short enough to allow Bathsheba's child (begotten in that adultery) to appear to be begotten in wedlock. The concluding words of the narration: **But the thing that David had done displeased the Lord*** contain the moral decision from the theocratical point of view, and are, as it were, the superscription to the following history of the divine judgments that fell on David and his house on account of this sin.

[For mention of other times of mourning, see Gen. l. 10; Deut. xxxiv. 8; 1 Sam. xxxi. 13; 2 Sam. xiv. 2. In particular cases special feeling would lead to an extension of the ordinary mourning-period.—Tr.]

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The history of David's fall from the height of his communion with God as "a man after God's own heart" into the deepest depth of sin and crime contains a serious and warning lesson concerning the *power* of sin even over those who are under the guidance of God's will and word, when they give place in a single point of their inner life to the yet unoccupied sinful lust therein hidden, and fail in faithfulness in the struggle against their own evil hearts, and in self-denial.

[It is obvious, and yet often overlooked by assailants of the morality of the Old Testament, that the history, in chronicling this sin of the "man after God's own heart," does not endorse, but distinctly condemns it. It admits that such a man could commit such a sin, and afterwards enjoy the favor of God; but only on the condition that the real bent of his soul, turned aside for awhile under temptation, was towards God and holiness.—Tr.]

2. The inscrutable development of many individual sins from *one* hidden root proceeds according to an inner natural law: the human will, by detaching the heart from the living God, surrenders itself to the power of sinful lust, and the latter through the removal of the moral forces that had hitherto held it down and controlled the outer and inner life, gets unrestrained dominion. When the life is at the highest point of communion with the living God, pride slips in and leads to an all the deeper fall. The enjoyment of experiences of divine favor and of the fruits of struggle for the kingdom of God, leaves the door of the heart open to fleshly security. Temporary rest from work and fight, though not in itself insidious, leads to moral indolence, to spiritual sloth, to carelessness and unfaithfulness in office and calling. Wicked lust, excited from without at a hidden point of the inner life, no longer finds limitations in thoughts on the solemn divine command and prohibition: Thou shalt and thou shalt not, in the warning and exhorting voice of conscience, in the restraints and hindrances of divine providence, in faithful performance of duty and labor in one's calling, whereby the kindled fire might again be smothered. The "evil conscience" that follows the satisfaction of evil lust leads on the beaten, slippery and precipitous path to lying and deception, in order to conceal the sin from men. From the soil of the heart poisoned by *one* sin, from perversion from God of feeling and will in *one* hidden point of the heart, comes one sin after another; and not only does the fruitfulness and frightfulness of sinful lust show itself in its production of an unbroken series of wicked thoughts and desires, but "the curse of the evil *deed*" is made complete in that "it must continue to produce evil."

3. It is a sign of the irresistible power of conscience, and an involuntary self-condemnation, when a man seeks in every way to conceal his sin from men, but to extenuate and justify it before God; and on the other hand unwillingness to make confession has its deepest ground in the pride of the human heart, which increases in proportion as the man becomes involved in sin, and the evil in him develops itself from the slightest beginnings into a power that exercises dominion over the whole inner life. "Whosoever commits sin, he is the servant of sin" [John viii. 14, comp. Rom. vi.—Tr.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[Hall: With what unwillingness, with what fear, do I still look upon the miscarriage of the man after God's own heart! O holy prophet, who can promise himself always to stand, when he sees thee fallen, and maimed with the fall! Let profane eyes behold thee contentedly, as a pattern, as an excuse for sinning; I shall never

* [A. Clarke refers to the similar incident in Bellerophon's life:

πόρεν δ' ὅγε σήματα λυγρά,
Γράψας ἐν πίνακι πτυκτῷ θυμοφθόρα πολλά.

(*Il.* VI. 168, 169).—Tr.]

look upon thee but through tears, as a woful spectacle of human infirmity.—TR.]

Ver. 1. SCHLIER: If God has granted us some special good fortune we will never be puffed up, but will rather become little and lowly, and the higher we rise the more will we humble ourselves. An humble man always finds grace and blessing, but pride always goes before a fall.

Ver. 2. DISSELHOFF: Idle hours bring forth idle thoughts, and idle thoughts are nothing but dry kindling-wood, that waits only for a spark to be suddenly ablaze.—All have had the painful experience that our sins often have their roots in indolence and unfaithfulness in our calling. As long as we walk and work in our office, we are encompassed with a wall. As soon as we fall out of our office, we fall away from our fortunes and become a prey to the enemy.—[HALL: There can be no safety to that soul, where the senses are let loose. He can never keep his covenant with God, that makes not a covenant with his eyes. It is an idle presumption to think the outward man may be free, while the inward is safe.—TAYLOR: Here, then, in the moral weakness which constant prosperity had created, in the opportunity which idleness afforded to temptation, and in the blunted sensibility which polygamy had superinduced, we see how David was so easily overcome.—CHRYSOSTOM: Youth is sometimes wiser and better than age. David the youth smote down the barbarian, and showed all philosophy (wisdom and piety), and when he grew older, then he sinned.—TR.]

Vers. 2-4. SCHLIER: Let us watch and pray; we may well need it. What shall become of us if a feeling of security arises in us? How shall we get through with a pure body and heart if we are filled with self-conceit? Let us also carefully avoid idleness; labor is a medicine against sin.—J. LANGE: One sin brings forth another, and one act of unfaithfulness to conscience draws another after it. James i. 15.—STARKE: Loneliness affords the most convenient time for the temptations of Satan (Matt. iv. 1 sq.).—S. SCHMID: The quieter and securer men are in things bodily, the more perilous is it for them in things spiritual.—DISSELHOFF: If the not fully slain ungodly impulses in the man after God's own heart grew up so quickly and to such strength when he deviated a finger's breadth from the way of the Lord—and the Lord allowed him to go—how will it be with the untamed lusts in our hearts? If such a story does not give one a view of the unfathomable depths of sin and of its power, he will never learn what sin is.—STARKE: Rulers sin in leading their subjects into sin, for they are not lords over God's command (Acts v. 29; Matt. xxii. 21).—[HALL: Had Bathsheba been mindful of her matrimonial fidelity, perhaps David had been soon checked in his inordinate desire; her facility furthers the sin. It is no excuse to say, I was tempted, though by the great, though by the holy and learned. Let the mover be never so glorious, if he stir us to evil, he must be entertained with defiance.—TR.]—SCHLIER: Human customs are carefully observed, and God's command is trodden under foot. People attend to outward forms and usages, and live on consoled thereby in their sins.—[HENRY: The aggravations of David's sin. (1) His age, at least fifty years. (2) He had many wives and concubines—this is insisted on, chap. xii. 8. (3) Uriah was one of his "worthies," a man of honor and virtue, now jeoparding life in his service. (4) David was a king, whom God had intrusted with the sword of justice, and he made himself a pattern, when he should have been a terror, to evil-doers.—TR.]

Vers. 6-9. CRAMER: When sin has once lodged itself it becomes fruitful, and bears other sins (James ii. 10).—[HALL: It is rare and hard to commit a single sin.—TR.]—SEB. SCHMID: The most cunning devices are often, through the special Providence of God, made a laughing-stock by the simplest simplicity.—OSIANDER: Although the ungodly seek out all manner of cunning inventions to cloak their sins, yet it does not succeed; for God knows how, in a wonderful manner, to bring even secret sins to light (Matt. x. 26).—SCHLIER: When we have sinned, how often we trouble ourselves to hide our sins from the world, but how little do we think of God's eye and God's judgment! How contented we are if only we stand free from censure before men, and can throw the blame upon others!

Vers. 14 sqq. OSIANDER: So great is the devil's cunning and wickedness that when once he has brought a man to fall, he drives him on to more and greater sins.—DISSELHOFF: As the poisonous seed, laid in the bosom of the earth, comes up and brings fruit a hundredfold, as one root branches into a hundred new ones, spreads with rapid growth through the whole field and sends up everywhere the wild shoots, not otherwise is it with the sin which a man hides in his heart. Inwardly it strikes its roots deeper, broader, mightier; outwardly it brings superabundant fruit. It blinds the eyes, stops the ears, petrifies the feeling, deadens the conscience. It bursts all tender bonds, it dulls and benumbs to all else that one held dear and holy on earth. Holy fear vanishes, the reins are cast off from the heart, and mean, hateful, foul traits of character, which one had reckoned impossible, reveal themselves in mournful nakedness.—SCHLIER: Sin takes a man captive, so that from one he hurls himself into another, so that sin becomes wantonness and crime, yea, even abomination. He who consents to sin, knows where the corruption begins, but who will undertake to say where it ends? And what is most fearful is the blindness into which sin casts the man, so that his eyes are holden, that he no longer knows what he is doing, no longer sees through the simplest things that were once known and familiar to him, but with eyes open rushes into ruin.

[TAYLOR: It may be asked, how can you account for such enormous iniquity in such a man as we have seen that David was? . . . . There are some men in whom everything is on a large scale. When their good nature is uppermost, they overtop all others in holiness; but if, unhappily, they should be thrown off their guard, and the old man should gain the mastery, some dreadful wickedness may be expected. This is all the more likely to be the case if the quality of intensity be added to their greatness; for a man with such a temperament is never anything by half. . . . . A man of David's nature ought to be more peculiarly on his guard than other men: The express train, dashing along at furious speed, will do more mischief if it runs off than the slow-going

horse-car in the city streets. Every one understands that; but every one demands, in consequence, that the driver of the one shall be proportionately more watchful than that of the other. With such a nature as David had, and knew that he had, he ought to have been supremely on his guard, while again the privileges which he had received from God rendered it both easy and practicable for him to be vigilant.—KINGSLEY: Such terrible crimes are not committed by men in a right state of mind. *Nemo repente fuit turpissimus.* He who commits adultery, treachery and murder, must have been long tampering, at least in heart, with all these. Had not David been playing upon the edge of sin, into sin he would not have fallen. He may have been quite unconscious of bad habits of mind; but they must have been there, growing in secret. The tyrannous self-will, which is too often developed by long success and command; the unscrupulous craft, which is too often developed by long adversity, and the necessity of sustaining one's self in a difficult position, ... and that fearful moral weakness which comes from long indulgence of the passions. . . . On David's own theory, that he was an utterly weak person without the help of God, the act is perfectly like David. It is what David would naturally do, when he had left hold of God. Had he left hold of God in the wilderness, he would have become a mere robber-chieftain. He does leave hold of God in his palace on Zion, and he becomes a mere Eastern despot.—TR.]

J. DISSELHOFF: The fall of the man after God's own heart: 1) What brought the beloved of God to so deep a fall? 2) He who once gives himself up to sin becomes its slave, and is driven ever deeper and deeper by its might.

[HALL: O God, Thou hadst never suffered so dear a favorite of Thine to fall so fearfully, if Thou hadst not meant to make him a universal example to mankind, of not presuming, of not despairing. How can we presume of not sinning, or despair for sinning, when we find so great a saint thus fallen, thus risen!—TR.]

[Ver. 1. This entire campaign, with the siege of a capital and slaying of thousands, interests us now only as the occasion of David's series of great sins. And in truth the striking excellencies or faults of one great and good man, when permanently recorded and widely read, become more important to the welfare of the human race than the overthrow of cities or kingdoms.—Ver. 2 sqq. What a series! A lascivious look (Matt. v. 28), actual adultery, pitiful and then base attempts at concealment, and finally a treacherous murder. How little David imagined, in the moment of lustful looking, that he was taking the first step in such a course of frightful wickedness!—Vers. 14, 15. Here is the darkest moment of this terrible story. Few scenes in all the sad history of our race are so disgraceful to human nature and so utterly disheartening to the beholder, as when David, the Psalmist and King, with such a history, such experiences, such promises, sat writing this letter.—Ver. 16. It is often hard to find helpers to virtue, but always easy to find helpers in vice and crime.—Ver. 17. Uriah the Hittite—immortal by his wrongs!—Ver. 25. Alas! often do men hide wicked designs, and satisfaction at successful plotting, under the common-places of resignation to the inevitable, of submission to the conditions of existence.—Ver. 27. So he seemed to have compassed his ends and effectually concealed his crime by a still baser crime. But his conscience slept uneasily its poisoned sleep, and Jehovah was displeased!—TR.]

[Vers. 2–27. *David's frightful fall.* 1) The inspired writings (unlike most biographies) narrate without reserve the faults of good men. 2) This story serves as an encouragement to sin, or as a solemn warning against sin, according to the spirit of him that reads it. We should discipline ourselves to take a right and wholesome view of other men's faults. 3) One sin leads to another; and attempts at concealment often involve one in greater difficulty, and tempt him to additional wrong. When a good man has been betrayed into crime, let him humbly confess it, and cut short the series. 4) If David fell, let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall (1 Cor. x. 12). CHRYSOSTOM: The narrow way has precipices on both sides. Let us walk it awake and watchful. For we are not more exact than David, who by a moment's neglect was precipitated into the very gulf of sin.—TR.]

---

2. Nathan's Exhortation to Repentance. David's Repentance. Conquest of Rabbah and Punishment of the Ammonites.

CHAP. XII. 1–31.

1 AND[1] the Lord [Jehovah] sent Nathan unto David. And he came unto him,
and said unto him, There were two men in one city, the one rich and the other
2, 3 poor.[2] The rich man had exceeding many flocks and herds. But [And] the

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. See Josephus' dressing up of the narrative of this chapter (*Ant.* 7, 7. 3–5). His additions are probably in part his own invention, and in part (as Böttcher remarks) taken from late glosses, from which also the Vulg. and Chald. may have drawn. In a few cases glosses of this sort seem to have found their way into our Heb. text.—TR.]

[2] [Ver. 1. ראשׁ, instead of the usual רשׁ, is found only in Sam. and Prov.; the א is always thrown out by the Masorites (Qeri) in the former book (omitted from the text in twenty-two MSS. of Kennicott), never in the

poor[3] man had nothing save one little ewe lamb, which he had bought and nou-
rished up; and it grew up together with him and with his children; it did eat of
his own meat [food], and drank of his own cup, and lay in his bosom, and was
4 unto him as a daughter. And there came a traveller unto the rich man, and he
spared to take of his own flock and of his own herd to dress for the wayfaring man
that was come unto him; but [and] took the poor man's lamb, and dressed it for
5 the man that was come to him. And David's anger was greatly kindled against
the man, and he said unto Nathan, As the Lord [Jehovah] liveth, the man that
6 hath done this thing shall surely die; And he shall restore the lamb fourfold,
because he did this thing and because he had no pity.

7 And Nathan said to David, Thou art the man. Thus saith the Lord [Jehovah]
God of Israel, I anointed thee king over Israel, and I delivered thee out of the
8 hand of Saul; And I gave thee thy master's house,[4] and thy master's wives into
thy bosom, and gave thee the house[4] of Israel and of Judah; and if that had been
too little, I would moreover [further] have given unto thee such and such things.
9 Wherefore hast thou despised the commandment of the Lord [Jehovah], to do evil
in his[5] sight? thou hast killed Uriah the Hittite with the sword, and hast taken
his wife to be thy wife, and hast slain him with the sword of the children of Am-
10 mon. Now,[6] therefore [And now] the sword shall never depart from thine house;
because thou hast despised me, and hast taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be
11 thy wife. Thus saith the Lord [Jehovah], Behold, I will raise up evil against
thee out of thine own house, and I will take thy wives before thine eyes, and give
them unto thy neighbor,[7] and he shall lie with thy wives in the light of this sun.
12 For thou didst it secretly; but I will do this thing before all Israel and before the
sun.

13 And David said unto Nathan, I have sinned against the Lord [Jehovah]. And

latter. It may be only a *scriptio plena*, or it may be from a verb ראשׁ collateral to רושׁ (comp. רֵאשׁ, "poverty," Prov. vi. 11). In either case it seems to have been thought by the Masorites unfit for a prose-text. The stem is not found in Aramaic.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 3. Some MSS. here write ראשׁ, see above.—Instead of כִּבְשָׂה we find in the Pentateuch כַּבְשָׂה and (by transposition) כִּשְׂבָּה (as כשב for כבשׂ); Böttcher suggests that the slenderer vowel (i) gives here a diminutive sense, but this is doubtful.—The Imperfects תֹּאכַל, תִּשְׁתֶּה and תִּשְׁכָּב here express customary action. Instead of כְּבַת some MSS. have לְבַת.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 8. Syr. בְּנַת, doubtless a clerical error. The Arab. follows the Syriac.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 9. Some MSS. and the Vulg. read: "in my eyes," which is approved by Norzius and De Rossi. Another reading is: in the eyes of Jehovah (some MSS., Syr., Arab.).—In the latter part of the verse the repetition of the statement that David slew Uriah has given offence to some critics, who take it to be meaningless; and Syr. omits the clause: "Uriah the Hittite thou hast slain with the sword," and transposes the two following. Böttcher therefore conjectures for the first phrase הִטִּית בְּאֹרֵב, "thou didst ambush Uriah," to which Thenius objects that the חֶרֶב of the following verse requires the same word here in the text, and that the two clauses are not identical in statement, but the second is descriptive and explanatory. The *Bib.-Com.* suggests that the last clause of this verse should be appended to ver. 10, where it seems required, whereby the repetition in ver. 9 would be avoided. On the other hand the absence of logical symmetry favors the present Heb. reading (as making it harder), while there is yet in it a certain rhetorical force; the speaker presses home in ver. 9 the charge of murder, and in ver. 10 thinks it sufficient to state the one fact (the marrying Bathsheba) that represents the whole crime.—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 10. Wellhausen regards vers. 10-12 as an interpolation, because no reference is made to the punishments announced in them, either in the "thou shalt not die" of ver. 13 or in ver. 14; and it is true ver. 13 attaches itself easily to ver. 9. Gramberg also (in Thenius) says that no pardon would really have been granted David, if Nathan had spoken vers. 11, 12. To this latter Thenius properly replies, that pardon (being conditioned on a state of soul) does not necessarily involve a setting aside of the natural effects of sin. So also as to Wellhausen's criticism, Nathan's course of thought may be thus represented: he sets forth David's sin (ver. 9), denounces against his *house* the everlasting vengeance of the sword (ver. 10), and an open requital of his crime on *him* personally (vers. 11, 12); thereupon David confesses his sin, anticipating the worst consequences for himself, and Nathan replies that (notwithstanding what had just been said) death should not now be visited on him; yet that he might not be without immediate punishment, his child should die. Thus the contrast between the punishment of vers. 10-12 and that of vers. 13, 14, will lie in the immediateness or remoteness. For the rest, it is not necessary to suppose that this scene occurred in a minute, even though we should not (with Ewald) assume a considerable interval of time in the middle of ver. 13 (at the Pisqa).—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 11. The Yod in רֵעֶיךָ is to be regarded as radical (though some MSS. omit it) and the word as singular.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 13. The masoretic note here is: "Pisqa (division) in the middle of the verse." This doubtless indicates that a pause was felt to be desirable between David's solemn confession of sin and Nathan's announcement of pardon; but whether it is also intended to indicate an interval of time must remain undetermined.—Tr.]

Nathan said unto David, The Lord [Jehovah] also hath put away thy sin; thou
14 shalt not die. Howbeit, because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to
the enemies[9] of the Lord [Jehovah] to blaspheme, the child also that is born unto
15 thee shall surely die. And Nathan departed [went] unto his house.
And the Lord [Jehovah] struck the child that Uriah's wife bare unto David,
16 and it was very sick. David therefore [And David] besought God for the child;
17 and David fasted, and went in and lay all night upon the earth [ground]. And
the elders of his house arose *and went* to him, to raise him up from the earth
18 [ground]; but he would not, neither did he eat bread with them. And it came to
pass on the seventh day, that the child died. And the servants of David feared
to tell him that the child was dead; for they said, Behold, while the child was yet
alive, we spake unto him, and he would not hearken unto our voice; how will he
then vex himself, if we tell him that the child is dead? [and how shall we say to
19 him, The child is dead? he will then act badly.] But when David [And David]
saw that his servants whispered, [*ins.* and] David perceived that the child was
20 dead; therefore [and] David said unto his servants, Is the child dead? And they
said, He is dead. Then [And] David arose from the earth [ground], and washed
and anointed himself, and changed his apparel, and came into the house of the
Lord [Jehovah] and worshipped; then he [and] came to his own house, and when
he required [and asked], [*ins.* and] they set bread before him, and he did eat.
21 Then said his servants [And his servants said] unto him, What thing is this that
thou hast done? thou didst fast and weep for the child *while it was* alive; but
22 [and] when the child was dead, thou didst rise and eat bread. And he said,
While the child was yet alive, I fasted and wept; for I said, Who can tell whether
23 God will be gracious to me, that the child may [shall] live? But now he is dead,
wherefore should I fast? can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he
24 shall not return to me. And David comforted Bathsheba his wife, and went in
unto her, and lay with her; and she bare a son, and he called his name Solomon;
25 and the Lord [Jehovah] loved him. And he sent by the hand of Nathan the
prophet; and he called his name Jedidiah, because of the Lord [Jehovah].
26 And Joab fought against Rabbah of the children of Ammon, and took the royal
27 city. And Joab sent messengers to David, and said, I have fought against Rab-
28 bah, and have taken the city of waters. Now, therefore [And now] gather the
rest of the people together, and encamp against the city and take it, lest I take
29 the city, and it be called after my name. And David gathered all the people
30 together, and went to Rabbah, and fought against it and took it. And he took
their king's crown from off his head, the weight whereof [and its weight] was a
talent of gold with the [and] precious stones; and it was *set* on David's head.
31 And he brought forth the spoil of the city in great abundance. And he brought
forth the people that were therein, and put[10] them under saws and under harrows
[threshing-sledges] of iron and under axes of iron, and made them pass through
the brick-kiln;[11] and thus he did unto all the cities of the children of Ammon. So
[And] David and all the people returned unto Jerusalem.

[9] [Ver. 14. So all versions and MSS. Geiger thinks that this is a case similar to 1 Sam. xxv. 22, where the "enemies" is inserted to avoid an irreverent or injurious expression. But in that passage (see the discussion there in "Text. and Gram.") the word "enemies" is obviously out of place, while here it suits very well; and the possibility of the causative sense of the Piel must be omitted. Yet if the Heb. text be retained, we must suppose some publicity given to David's crime; and the reading: "thou hast despised Jehovah," would agree well with the context.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 31. Chron. (xx. 3) has וישר, "he sawed," which is adopted by Erdmann, *Bib.-Com.*, and most critics. The Heb. phrase here is unusual and hard, and the reading of Chron. has against it only that the verb *sawed* does not agree well with the instruments of threshing and cutting. Therefore a general sense, *cut*, has been assigned to the verb, which, however, is doubtful. It is held by some that our Heb. text means only that David put his prisoners to work with saws, *etc.*; but the words will hardly bear this interpretation. Chald. has "sawed" (מסר), and so the Vulg. (probably a paraphrase).—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 31. Erdmann: "made them enter their Moloch," retaining the Kethib, as he explains in his exposition. Eng. A. V. adopts the Qeri, which seems the better reading.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. Vers. 1–12. *Nathan's exhortation to repentance.*—Ver. 1. **And the Lord sent.**—Nathan received his *commission* to David as *prophet;* as the Septuagint., Syr., Arab. and some MSS., rightly indicate by the addition of the explanatory phrase "the prophet" [after "Nathan"]. After the words "said unto him" the Vulgate adds "give me your opinion" (*responde mihi judicium*), a gloss, probably occasioned by the fact that Na-

than's discourse begins immediately with a parallel.*—David is caught beforehand in the cleverly spread net of the prophet's parable.—Ver. 3. The poor man had "nothing at all" but one lamb, which he "kept alive," supported, reared. It was not a pet-lamb (Keil), since the man had absolutely no other possession in cattle. As a poor man he had the means of buying only one little lamb, which he was now raising, and which he loved the more as it was his only property. [*Bib.-Com.:* All these circumstances are exquisitely contrived to heighten the pity and indignation of the hearer.—Tr.].—Ver. 4.† [The three designations "traveller," "wayfarer," "the man that came to him," are rhetorical variations and mean the same thing substantially, though the last is obviously specially appropriate in its place. Some of the rabbis and the fathers (quoted with apparent approval by Wordsworth) make the three names set forth lust in its different stages of growth, as a passer-by, as a guest, as a permanent inmate; of course this allegorizing is out of place here.—Tr.].—Vers. 5 *sqq.* Nathan so told his story that David must needs believe it referred to a deed of violence to be immediately punished, not supposing at all that it concerned him.‡ Hence his violent indignation. The *fourfold* compensation for a stolen sheep was a legal provision, Ex. xxi. 37. The *sevenfold* of the Sept. is to be explained by the fact that the number seven was so common among the Hebrews. Comp. Prov. vi. 31. [The Chald. says *fortyfold*, either by clerical error, or in a mere spirit of exaggeration. This variation may suggest the uncertainty of Böttcher's view, that the Heb. text here has the priestly recension (according to the law in Exodus) and the Greek the laic recension. Nor is there any ground for the assertion of Thenius (and Wellhausen) that David was certainly here not thinking of the law in Exodus, and that the Greek text is the original. Though the Book of Exodus in its present shape may not have existed in David's time, there is no reason why this law should not have been known.—Tr.].—Ver. 7. **Thou art the man.**—The farther David was from thinking of a reference to himself, the greater the force with which this word must have struck him. The account here given of the firmness and wisdom with which Nathan approached the king is "inimitably admirable" (Ewald). The Sept. and Vulg. [not the common Vulg. text,—Tr.], have: "thou art the man that has done this," a mere explanatory addition. **Thus saith the Lord the God of Israel.**—The following words, as far as ver. 9, bring out most clearly *the greatness of David's guilt* in various points: 1) from the point of view of his *royal office;* his crime is most sharply *opposed* to his *divine induction* thereinto; 2) his deliverance from Saul was a gracious act of God, for which he has here shown himself in the highest degree ungrateful; 3) David might unblamed have taken his predecessor's wives (Thenius); this is the only meaning to be attached to the words: "I gave thee thy master's house, and thy master's wives into thy bosom." [Bp. Patrick and others give the later Jewish understanding of the law or custom: the king and no other person fell heir to the property and harem of his predecessor, but it did not follow that he actually married the inmates of the harem; they might be merely a part of his establishment. If it was a son that succeeded his father, he treated these women with reverence; if no blood-relationship existed between the two kings, the successor might actually take the women as his wives (Philippson). As to the morality of the act, it was a natural result of a polygamous system, and morally in the same category with it; and polygamy was allowed by the Mosaic Law.—Tr.]. According to 1 Sam. xiv. 50 Saul had only *one* wife, and according to 2 Sam. iii. 7 only *one* concubine who fell into Abner's hands. 4) David, as king, had control of all Israel (1 Sam. viii. 16), and might have increased his establishment from their daughters, without committing this crime. **And I have given thee the house of Israel**; instead of "house" Syr. and Arab. read "daughters," for which change, according to the above explanation, there is no need. 5) David despised, transgressed the "word," that is, the law of God by slaying Uriah. The Heb. text has: "in *his* eyes," the margin: "in *my* eyes;" the difference is insignificant.* This crime is heightened, however, by the fact that he committed the murder by "the sword of the children of Ammon." With this added statement and the use of the stronger word "murder" [Eng. A. V. slain] instead of "slay," the fact already mentioned is repeated, in order that the culmination of the iniquity, the using the enemies of God's people as its instrument, may come forth more sharply.

Vers. 10–12. *Threat of punishment, David's misdeed being again characterized as a factual contempt of the Lord.* Instead of: "Thou hast despised the word of the Lord," it is here said: "Thou hast despised Me." For in His word *the Lord Himself* reveals Himself. For this reason, because David is guilty of despising the Lord, 1) "*the sword shall not depart from his house forever,*" that is, as long as the house or posterity of David shall last. From the seed of this evil deed of David sprang the poisonous fruit of the evil deeds of his sons and the consequent domestic and fraternal war. The bloody sword appears in the mur-

* [It is doubtful whether this phrase belongs to the Vulgate text. It is not found in our present printed edition, nor in the Codex Amiatinus; and the expression is not Hebrew but Latin (Wellhausen).—Josephus' language "he asked him to tell him what he thought" (Ant. 7, 7, 3) is a natural introduction in Josephus' expansive manner, and does not necessarily suggest a corresponding phrase in his Greek text.—Tr.]

† לְאִישׁ, anarthrous, defined by the Article with the following adjective. See Ewald, § 293 *a*.

‡ [Especially as no murder is introduced into the parable. No doubt it was part of Nathan's plan, as Dr. Erdmann suggests, to conceal the immediate reference from David. He therefore does not minutely imitate the circumstances of David's crime, and the interpretation of the parable must simply take the central thought and apply it. Here was a man that wronged his neighbor by depriving him of valuable property; the wrong is heightened by the fact that the aggressor has much and the sufferer little. Such an aggressor was David. Farther than this it is not proper to carry the interpretation of particulars. Abarbanel's explanation (given by Patrick) is too minute.—Tr.]

* [In Hahn's ed. of the Heb. Bib. both text and margin have "his eyes" (with a mere orthographic difference); but in some other edd. (see De Rossi) the Qeri or margin is as Dr. Erdmann states.—Tr.]

der of the incestuous Amnon by Absalom (xiii. 28, 29), in the death of the rebel Absalom (xiii., xiv.), and in the execution of Adonijah (1 Kings ii. 24, 25). Thereby is Uriah's murder punished; 2) David is threatened with disgrace through the disgrace of his wives. **To thy neighbor .... in the sight of the sun**—before all Israel. For the fulfilment by Absalom, see xvi. 22, and comp. 1 Kings ii. 23 sq., where Adonijah asks for Abishag the Shunammite. [On the text in vers. 9, 10 see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

Vers. 13–23. *David's penitent confession and punishment by the death of the child of Bathsheba.*—Ver. 13. **I have sinned against the Lord.**—This frank, short, honest confession of sin was made not some time after this discourse of Nathan, but immediately as its direct result. The power of the prophetic word laid hold of the depths of his heart and conscience; the divine truth, which inexorably laid bare his sin, put an end to all self-deception and all anxious effort to cover up and palliate his transgression of the divine word. He confesses his sin as a sin *against the Lord*, to show that he clearly recognizes it to be, what it essentially is, a contradiction of God's holy will. Nathan's answer is the announcement of the Lord's grace 1) in forgiving the sin: **The Lord will cause** [or, **has caused**—Tr.] **thy sin to pass over**, that is, it is not to remain before him, but to vanish, be forgiven; 2) in remitting the deserved punishment: **Thou shalt not die!**—As adulterer and homicide David had deserved death; but this just punishment was not executed, because he honestly repented and did not harden his heart against the Lord. [Probably the civil law in such a case could not have been enforced against an absolute king by human authority; but God could have found means to execute it. Clearly it is physical death that is here meant, not the death of the soul (against Wordsworth and *Bib.-Com.*).—In the Mosaic code there is no provision against such a marriage as that of David and Bathsheba; on general moral grounds it would have been pronounced wrong. Yet there were also reasons why the marriage should take place, and God Himself solves the ethical question by the mouth of His prophet, not increasing the evil by sundering the marriage tie, but so chastising the sinners that one of them at least must have remembered the lesson to the end of his life.—According to the later Jewish law the marriage was illegal; and some Jewish writers have tried hard to clear David of the charge of adultery. See Patrick's Comm., 2 Sam. xi. 27 and 4.—Tr.].—This is not inconsistent with the threat of punishment in ver. 14, the fulfilment of which is specially founded on the provocation to blasphemy given to the heathen. **Only because thou hast made the enemies of the Lord to despise* (him).** The enemies of the people of Israel were also enemies of the Lord and of the king of this people. Towards the heathen Israel's duty was, by obedience to God's word and commands, to set forth the theocracy and bring it to honor and recognition. Transgression of God's command by the king himself must lead the heathen to heap shame and reproach on Israel and its God; and there must therefore be expiation by punishment. David and Bathsheba must lose their adulterously begotten child, and this should be a sign to the Lord's enemies of the severe justice of the God of Israel. "The child also, *etc.*;" the statement is introduced by the word *also* as in keeping with what precedes (גַּם, not *howbeit*, but *also*).—Ver. 15. **The Lord smote the child.**—The fulfilment followed immediately on the prediction. The sickness is represented as a punishment inflicted by God; therefore is added: **which the wife of Uriah had borne to David.**—[It was, then, apparently not till after the birth of the child that Nathan came to David; the latter had remained many months seemingly unconscious of his sin.—Tr.].—Ver. 16. David acknowledges the punishing hand of the Lord. He goes away to a retired spot, to collect himself and pour out his heart before God. The phrase "went in" refers to his going not to the Sanctuary (to which he does not go till ver. 20), but to a quiet room in his house, where he could be alone; Vulg.: *ingressus seorsum* ["he went in apart"].—Ver. 17. **The elders of his house** are its oldest and most trusted servants. Comp. Gen. xxiv. 2; l. 7. So Clericus. Whether David's uncles and oldest brothers are thereby meant (Ewald) must remain undecided.—Ver. 18. The elders hesitate to tell David of the death of the child, lest he be plunged into deeper grief, or do himself a harm. Vulg.: "how much more will he afflict himself?" [David's affection for this child is remarkable. He was a "great lover of his children" (Patrick) and perhaps specially attached to this one by reason of his love for its mother.—Tr.].—Ver. 19 sqq. David's conduct is the opposite of what the servants expected. The solution of their perplexity lay in the fact that David had hitherto prayed for the child's life, but now bowed humbly beneath God's hand, and thus gains strength *joyfully* to bear the burden laid on him. David's *two* courses of conduct in immediate juxtaposition have *one* common source within him; namely, humble, unconditional devotion of heart to the will of the Lord. After "and he asked" [ver. 20] "bread" is omitted, because it is mentioned immediately afterwards. The shorter phrase is obviously original; the addition of the Sept.: "bread to eat," is an interpretation.—Ver. 21. Render: "thou didst fast and weep *for* (בַּעֲבוּר) the child, while it yet lived" [= for the child living—Tr.]; so Vulg., Cler., Ew. § 341 *b* [Sept., Eng. A. V.]; not "while the child lived" (Ges., De Wette, Maur., Keil [Chald., Syr., Luther]), since as conjunction the word denotes only either the ground or the end.*—Ver. 22. See on vers. 19 sqq. De-

* נָאֵץ Piel Inf. Abs.; the i for assonance with the following Perfect, Ew. § 240 c.

* [Sept., changing the accents, has: "what is this that thou hast done for the child? while it yet lived thou didst fast, *etc.*," and this is adopted by Thenius (after Hitzig), and declared by Wellhausen to be the only possible construction of the words. The latter, however, points out the two difficulties in this construction, that we do not expect any qualifying phrase after "thou hast done," and that the curtness and isolation of the חַי is hard. He therefore reads בְּעוֹד (as in ver. 22) "while the child was yet alive" instead of בַּעֲבוּר, for which, says Böttcher, there is no need. The construction of Eng. A. V., though not without its difficulties, may be retained, though Wellhausen's suggestion commends itself as more natural and grammatical.—Tr.]

vid had continued to hope that the Lord would hear his prayer* and spare the child.—Ver. 23. The continued existence of the child's soul in Sheol is here assumed, and the hope of reunion with it expressed. "Nothing is said, indeed, of conscious existence, but this must have been supposed, in order to find consolation and repose in going to the dead" (Böttch., *de inferis*, § 109 sq.).

Vers. 24, 25. *Birth of Solomon.* **David comforted Bathsheba**, because he himself had received comfort. The Sept. prefixes "she conceived" to our appropriately curt text "she bare a son." **And he called his name Solomon.**† Solomon's birth is mentioned here because of its factual connection with what precedes. The name *Solomon*, like the similar names in Lev. xxiv. 11; Num. xxxiv. 27; 1 Chr. xxvi. 25 sq., was "an old and common one . . . it is therefore wholly without foundation to say that Solomon first received this name from the 'peace' of his time" (Ew., Gesch. [Hist. of Israel] III. p. 228, Rem. 1). It is probable, indeed, that Solomon's birth occurred just after the conquest of Rabbah related below; for, as Bathsheba's first son was conceived during the siege, this siege, if Solomon was born *before* its termination, would have lasted about two years [Cler., Thenius]. Nevertheless the name Solomon is to be explained not from the peace gained by the Ammonite war, but (after 1 Chr. xxii. 9) from the wish that peace might be allotted him as a gift of God, in contrast with the continual wars of his father's life. **And the Lord loved him.**—Here instead of David, the Lord appears as subject; and so in the verb "sent" [ver. 25] the Lord is subject, not David, since the latter had already given the name Solomon. Ewald renders: "he (David) asked through Nathan from the oracle a loftier name for his new-born son;" but this rests on the inappropriate conception of the words "Jehovah loved *him*" as referring to the maintenance of this child's life [in contrast with the dead child—Tr.], apart from the fact that the subject "Jehovah" is again arbitrarily changed. This last consideration is also against the rendering: "and he (David) gave him into the hand of Nathan the prophet (to bring up)," where the Piel of the verb would be required. The expression in the text (Qal with בְּיַד [to send by the hand of]) means to give a commission (comp. Ex. iv. 13). Jehovah sent Nathan to David with the commission to give the child the name *Jedidiah*. Nathan is expressly called *prophet*, because he appeared in divine commission as such. This was the factual opposite of the former message [ver. 1], God's declaration that He had bestowed His grace and mercy on David and his child. The subject of the verb "called" is Nathan. "On account of Jehovah," that is, because Jehovah loved him, as the name signified (= "beloved of Jehovah," Germ. *Gottlieb.*)* While *Solomon* was the name given him by his parents, by which he was to be called, *Jedidiah*, as the high name given him by the prophet, denoted the Lord's love and faithfulness bestowed on him whose light was to illumine his whole life. [Böttcher, Thenius and Wellhausen insist on rendering ver. 25: "and he committed him to the care of Nathan," *etc.*, which agrees, says Thenius, with the general opinion (of which, however, there is not a word in the Bible) that Nathan was Solomon's tutor. This is also the view of Victorinus Strigelius quoted by Patrick, and is certainly more in keeping with the context than the other. If the view of Eng. A. V. and Erdmann be correct we should expect some additional explanatory phrase; unless the next sentence is such a complementary phrase, in which case the subject of "called" must be the same as that of "sent," namely Jehovah. But, as Erdmann himself points out, the subject of "called" is not Jehovah, but either Nathan or David. For this reason it seems better to take David also as subject of "sent" or delivered." David committed him (reading the Piel) to Nathan, and Nathan gave him his higher name. Comp. similar second names in the histories of Abraham and Sarah, Jacob and Simon Peter.—Then. remarks of this whole narrative that its exact fidelity to nature and touching simplicity, when we recollect that the scenes passed in the interior of the palace, show that it must have been communicated by a *contemporary*.—Tr.]

Vers. 26–31. *Conquest of Rabbah and cruel punishment of the Ammonites.* Comp. 1 Chr. xx. 1–3. —Ver. 26 sqq. The narrative returns to xi. 1. From the connection the "city of the kingdom,"† the capital of the kingdom, is the whole city, not merely the water-town (ver. 27) "excluding the acropolis" (Keil). Joab, as commanding general, conducting the siege, conquered the whole city; and this result is here summarily stated in advance. [But this statement does not read like an anticipative summary; the capture of ver. 29 seems to be different from that of ver. 26.—Tr.]. —Ver. 27 sq. Detailed account of the affair, especially how Joab, after taking the water-city, summoned the king, who had remained in Jerusalem (xi. 1), in order that the remaining higher part of the city might be taken under his direction to the honor of the royal name. And so it happened, though it was none the less true (ver. 26) that Joab was the real conqueror. Vulg.: "lest, the city being taken by me, the victory should be ascribed to my name." Luther: "that I may not have the name of it."—To judge from the ruins of Ammon (comp. Ritter XV., p. 1145 sq.) the capital-city of the Ammonites lay on both banks of the Upper Jabbok, in a narrow valley, on the north side of which on an eminence was the citadel ("the city" ver. 28) towering above

* Kethib יְחָנַּנִי Impf. Qal, Qeri וְחַנַּנִי Perf. with Waw consecutive.

† [Solomon, in Heb. *Shelomoh*, = "peaceful." Other names from the same stem are Shalmai (Ezr. ii. 46, margin), Shelomi (Num. xxxiv. 27), Shelumiel (Numb. i. 6), Shelemiah (1 Chr. xxvi. 14), Shelomith (Lev. xxiv. 11; 2 Chr. xi. 20). Sept. and Vulg. write Salomon, and New Test. (Greek) Solomon, which our translators have adopted (*Bib.-Com.*). The Arabic form is Suleiman, Syr. Sheleimun. The final *n* comes from the attempt of the Sept. to give the name a Greek appearance, or, it may really have taken this form in Egypt.—Tr.]

* [The first part of the name Jedidiah means the same as David. Comp. Amadeus.—Tr.]

† [There is a disposition to assimilate the two designations in vers. 26 and 27, city of the kingdom and city of water. In ver. 27 Syr., Arab., Chald., and some Heb. MSS. read as in ver. 26, and Wellhausen proposes to read ver. 26 as ver. 27. Certainly if Joab had already captured the whole city, there would be no room for David's capture (ver. 29), and so Keil's explanation must be adopted if we retain the Heb. text.—Tr.]

the whole lower city ("the water-city"). This citadel was not taken by Joab till David came, in order that the completion of the conquest might appear as the deed of the king himself. See Curt. 6, 6 (quoted by Grotius): "he (Craterus), after everything was prepared, awaited the coming of the king (Alexander), yielding to him, as was proper, the honor of the capture of the city."—[Eng. A. V. has: "and it be called after my name." As there seems to be no example of a conquered city's being called after the name of the conqueror, it may be better to render (with Erdmann and others): "and my name be called (or honored) upon (in respect to) it." However, the ordinary meaning of the phrase is as in Eng. A. V.—Joab's conduct here is either that of a devoted servant, wishing to give his master honor or shield him from popular disfavor (on account of the affair of Bathsheba), or that of an adroit courtier, who will not run the risk of exciting his king's envy by too much success (see 1 Sam. xviii. 6-8).—Tr.].—Ver. 29. **All the people**, the soldiers that had remained at home; the besieging force had to be strengthened in order to conquer the strong Upper City.—Ver. 30. When the citadel was taken, the king of the Ammonites was either killed or captured. David took the *crown* from his head, and set it on his own, in order to represent himself as lord of the Ammonite kingdom. The *kikkar* [talent] was 3000 shekels (comp. Winer, *s. v. Gewichte*); the weight of the crown was 83½ [Dresden] pounds [= about 100 English pounds, for the silver talent, which was probably the current unit of weight; the gold-talent weighed twice as much.—Tr.]. This heavy crown of gold and precious stones might have been worn during the short time of coronation by a strong man like David. In many places now weights scarcely less heavy are borne on the head even by women. We need not, therefore, suppose that the weight is here accidentally exaggerated (Keil), nor that the crown was supported on the throne above the head (Clericus). [Some would understand that the *value*, and not the weight of the crown is here given; but the text-word can mean nothing but "weight." The Sept. has: "he took the crown of Molchom their king from his head." This reading Molkom or Milkom instead of "their king" is adopted by Geiger (p. 306), who sees in our Hebrew text an illustration of the tendency to get rid of the names of idol deities. As our text stands the suffix "their" is strange, since the Ammonites are not mentioned immediately before (Wellh.), and we might also expect here the mention of the Ammonite king by name (*Bib.-Comm.*). We may therefore render: "he took Malcom's (Moloch's) crown from his head."—Tr.].—Ver. 31. The cruel punishments inflicted by David on the Ammonites were probably the same that they were accustomed to inflict on the Israelites or other nations in war. For their cruelties see 1 Sam. xi. 2 and Am. i. 8. As they did, so it was done to them. Instead of "he put them under saws, *etc.*" we must read: "he cut them with saws, *etc.*," as in Chron. and the Targum (שׂור instead of שׂום); our present text can only be rendered: "he put them into saws," *etc.*, a phrase that cannot be applied to the saw. Comp. Heb. xi. 37, and Sueton. Caligula 27: "he cut them in two with the saw." **And with cutting instruments** [Eng. A. V. axes] **of iron.** Instead of this 1 Chr. xx. 3 has "saws" a second time, a clerical error* for "axes" [Eng. A. V. corrects the error, and renders "axes."—Tr.].—In the next clause the Qeri, Sept. and Vulg. [and Eng. A. V.] read: "made them pass through the brick-kiln,"† that is, burned them in brick-kilns (Keil). But the text is to be retained with Kimchi, whose explanation is essentially correct: "he passed them through Malchan, *i. e.*, the place where the Ammonites burned their sons to their idol." Instead of *malkan* (from מֹלֶךְ = Moloch) we may with Bött. pronounce the word *milkon*=*milkom*.‡ Both denote the *image* of *Moloch* (comp. 1 Kings xi. 5, 33). In the burning image human sacrifices were offered to Moloch, and "to cause to pass through (or, through the fire) to Moloch" is the usual phrase for this idol-service§ (see Lev. xviii. 21; 2 Kings xxiii. 10; Jer. xxxii. 35; Ezek. xx. 31). "The design was to inflict a striking punishment on idolatry, and in so far the war was a holy one" (Then.). The milder explanation of the punishment as consisting in the imposition of severe labors, cutting wood, burning bricks, *etc.* (Danz and others) is inconsistent with the words of the text. However, the text does not require us to suppose that all the inhabitants of Rabbah were thus treated; it was probably only the soldiers that were in the Upper City ["and so he did to all the cities of the Ammonites."—Tr.].

By this Ammonite war (probably the last that he waged) David had extended and strengthened his kingdom toward the whole east. By all his wars (Chron. viii. sqq.) the boundaries of his kingdom were so far extended that it was secure against heathen nations. But this splendor of outward power and dominion stood in sharp contrast with the inward disintegration of the royal house and of the whole people through David's sin.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. David's *condition of soul* in the time from his fall to his repentance may be understood from the fact that it needed such a strong impulse as Nathan's discourse to bring him to repentance, while on the other hand the word of confession followed immediately on the discourse. This latter indicates that his conscience had accused him of sin; but frank confession had been somehow hindered, till the hindrance was set aside by Nathan's word. The confession was preceded

---

* מְגֵרוֹת for כַּגְזֵרוֹת.

† מַלְבֵּן instead of Kethib מלכן.

‡ Böttcher: The Kethib needs no change, for מִלְכֹּן is a Hebraized form of מִלְכֹּם, the ending *om* being augmentative.

§ [As Dr. Erdmann remarks, the standing formula is "to pass through *to* Moloch," and the Heb. text cannot be so rendered; it is "in" malkon. It is a further objection to this view that the phrase was used distinctly of the worship of Moloch, and would hardly be used of an act of punishment. But if the Qeri be adopted, the phrase is still hard, because of the preposition: "he made them pass through *in* the kiln," the usual phrase omitting the preposition. No satisfactory translation of the words has yet been offered.—Tr.]

by a *silence*, which did *not* proceed from a contrite heart, but concealed an unquiet conscience and distracted heart. Thenius rightly says: "*Psalm* xxxii. describes what David felt before he was led to confession of sin by Nathan's address." The expression (vers. 3, 4): "for I kept silence; my bones wasted away in my crying all the day; for day and night thy hand was heavy upon me," sets forth how his silence was accompanied by consuming anguish of body and soul, wherein he felt in his conscience the oppressive burden of God's punitive righteousness, without being thereby moved to confession of sin. "We see plainly from Psalm xxxii. what bitter inward struggles he endured before he yielded to the divine chastisement and grew strong enough to confess his sins openly before God" (Ewald). These inward conflicts were produced by two factors: (1) the constant "*weight of God's hand on him*"—the accusing, condemning voice of conscience, the inward completion of the divine judgment; (2) his impenitent, uncontrite heart (which was *the cause of his silence*), which wished to "maintain its rights" by self-excuse and self-justification against the inevitable divine judgment (comp. Ps. li. 6). This was "*the guile* in his spirit" (ver. 2), which was the *ground* of his silence ("for," ver. 3). He was not *upright in heart* (ver. 11), so that he did not honestly confess his sins, but *concealed* them (comp. ver. 5). Thus Psalm xxxii. fills out our picture of David's condition and conduct after his sin and after Nathan's piercing punitory discourse. Against the reference of this Psalm to the crime of David against Bathsheba it has been alleged (De Wette, Stier, Clauss, Hitzig) that in it the confession comes from inward pain of conscience, while in 2 Sam. xii. it is occasioned by Nathan's discourse. The two facts, however, are not mutually exclusive, but mutually complementary. Nathan's discourse is not the *ground*, but the *occasion* of David's confession. See Hengstenberg on Ps. xxxii. for the particular points in which the Psalm and the history correspond to one another.

2. The *deceit* of the impenitent heart consists in its seeking to excuse and justify itself despite the condemnation of conscience, while it yet obtains no relief from the feeling of guilt, rather brings about a sharper reaction of conscience, and increases the pains that come from the conflict of mutually accusing and excusing thoughts. Sin is not gotten rid of by *failure to acknowledge it;* it rests all the more heavily on the conscience, and the closer the mouth that ought to confess is shut, the clearer sounds out the accusing, judging voice of conscience. "The roots of this deceit (which appears immediately after the Fall of man) are pride, lack of trust in God, and love of sin. Many are thereby kept altogether from confession of sin, in Pelagian self-blinding take delight in their wretchedness, and think themselves most excellent. In others are seen the beginnings of true confession; but they do not obtain the goal, because guile prevents them from acknowledging the whole extent of their harm. And even they that have really come into a gracious state, greatly embitter by guile the blessing of the forgiveness, that they have attained through sincerity. What especially exposes them to this temptation is their strict view of sin and of its condemnableness before God and the consciousness of the grace received from God and of their situation. Nature struggles vigorously against the deep humiliation which (especially for them) recognition and confession of sin carries with it. It is therefore necessary that they lay deeply to heart David's word (vers. 1, 2), spoken out of painful experience of the misery of guile: happy is he whose transgression is removed, *etc.*" (Hengst.). But it is a quality of the *deceit* of the impenitent heart to apply God's word, the mirror of sin, to others rather than to itself, and thus to put away self-examination and self-knowledge in its light.

3. *The grace of God* does not suffer man to go on unwarned in the path of sin, but leads him to recognition and confession of sin, and to an humble bowing under the mighty hand that must smite him for his sin. The divine grace herein employs *human instruments* like Nathan; and the *only effective means* in this case of bringing men to confession is the *word of God*, which 1) shows them *sin* in its *true form*, in unadorned *full reality*, in all its baseness and shockingness (comp. vers. 1–6); 2) points out the fulness of the *divine benefits* that should have kept them from sin, in the presence of which sin appears as sheer ingratitude (vers. 7, 8); 3) presses home *the demands of God's holy will* in His *word* and law (ver. 9); and 4) exhibits *the inevitable results* of sin as the sign of the divine retributive righteousness, under which man must bow.—When a man quietly opens his heart, as David did, to this ministry of grace (that leads to penitence), then appears its *purposed working:* 1) deep, penitent *recognition* of sin, not merely as an offence against man, but as enmity "against the Lord Himself," so that there is an end to the blindness about the *nature* of sin, founded on self-love; 2) sincere, frank *confession* of sin as an *offence* against the holy God, so that now ceases the inward conflict of opposing accusations and excuses, of a condemning conscience and a pride founded on self-justifying self-love. Open confession of sin was a legal part of the sin-offering, Lev. v. 5; xvi. 21; Num. v. 7.—"I have sinned against the Lord. The words are very few, as with the publican in Luke xviii. 13. But just that is a good sign of a truly broken heart; here is no excusing, no shrouding, no belittling of sin; no hiding-place is sought; no pretext used, no human weakness pleaded" (*Berl. Bib.*); 3) *personal experience of the comfort of the forgiveness of sin*, granted to the sinner of God's free grace, he having done nothing to deserve it. "The Lord also hath taken away thy sin" (ver. 13). From this experience comes confidence and certainty of the grace received; 4) *humble, quiet submission* to the *suffering* inflicted by the Lord as the *consequence* of sin, which is to be for the chastisement, purification and trying of the penitent and believing heart (vers. 14–23), and 5) renewed *enjoyment* of the *friendliness and goodness of the divine love* (vers. 24, 25).

4. As Ps. xxxii. exhibits the frame of mind out of which David came to sincere penitence, so Ps. li. (as the title indicates) is the echo of the *personal experience of God's grace*, which alone is

the *source* of the forgiveness of sin and blotting out of guilt (vers. 3. 4 [Eng. 1, 2]), under the condition of penitent confession of personal transgression against the Lord deeply founded in inborn sinfulness (vers 5–8 [3–6]), and of humble *supplication* for grace (vers. 9–11 [7–9]) and renewal (vers. 12–14 [10–12]) out of a broken and contrite heart (vers. 15–21 [13–19]). On the correspondence of the chief features of this Psalm with the history see Hengstenberg's and Hupfeld's commentaries thereon.—[If Ps. li. was written or composed on this occasion, then the two last verses must probably be regarded as a later addition (the sentiment is similar to that of liii. 7 (6); lxxix. 9, and other passages). For the rest, the spiritual teaching of this Psalm and Ps. xxxii. is entirely independent of their historical origin.—Tr.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

God does not leave men in their sins to go their own way unwarned and unchastised, but sends His messengers after them to call them to repentance.—The word of God that would call the sinner to repentance reminds him on the one hand of the fulness of the divine manifestations of grace and the manifold gifts of God's goodness, in order to shame the sinner for his ingratitude and disobedience; on the other hand it points him to the earnestness of God's holiness and righteousness in His commands. To this end it often clothes itself in image and similitude, in order either to work in the man receptivity for the indwelling power that awakens to repentance, if the man *will* give heed, or so far as this is not the case, so much the more to harden the inner man, comp. Matt. xiii. 10–16.

The right sort of awakening preaching consists in immediate direct application of the word of God to individual hearts, so that after holding up the mirror of God's law, it is always said: Thou art the man! Men are always, according to their natural disposition, inclined to look not at their own sins, but at the sins of others, to judge and pass sentence on them. Such looking away from one's self to the sins in the world around often finds its occasion and temptation in preaching upon the universal sinfulness of mankind and in testimonies against the sins of the times or of a whole people; if these testimonies are to be effectual for awakening in the hearers a true repentance, they must have their point in the word: Thou art the man!—As clearly as the sins of others, should we see and recognize our own sins; as inexorably and strictly as we judge and pass sentence upon others, should we enter into judgment with ourselves. But this is done only when we let the word: "Thou art the man," press into our hearts.

The humble confession: "I have sinned against the Lord," roots itself in the penitent recognition of guilt, and has as a consequence the assurance of forgiveness of all sins, not as something thereby deserved and won but as a gift of the free grace of God, which grace immediately answers the honest and penitent confession of guilt by acquitting of guilt; the sinner's unreserved confession is followed by unconditional divine absolution.

Rescue of the man fallen into sin. 1) The compassionate God stretches out to him the receiving hand (Nathan's mission and reproof). 2) The fallen one seizes this hand, and by its help lifts himself up in humility of heart and honest confession of guilt.—*Repentance and grace:* 1) How repentance is a work of grace, or how grace leads to repentance, and 2) How the experience of grace in the consolation of forgiveness is conditioned on repentance, or how repentance leads to grace.—*The right sort of awakening preaching* is that which 1) In view of the fulness of God's goodness reveals the sinner's ingratitude, 2) In view of the earnestness of God's commands reveals the sinner's disobedience, and 3) Puts an end to all self-justification and excuses by the earnestness of the word: Thou art the man!

True Repentance: 1) Wherein it *consists.* In penitent recognition and confession of sin as of enmity against the holy God ("I have sinned *against the Lord*"). 2) How it is *attained.* In the ways along which the sinner is led by seeking, pursuing and preventing grace. 3) Whither it *leads.* To the consolation of the forgiveness of all sins, to an humble yielding to the chastening hand of God under the sufferings which necessarily follow from sin, and to new experiences of God's love in the joy which, after sufferings patiently borne, is granted by Him.—The *painful consequences of sin* are for the penitent man a means of grace. 1) In order to *prove* and try his *faith* and *confidence* in God's fatherly love. 2) To *chasten* and instruct in righteousness, according to the holy will of God. 3) To *purge* from still clinging sinfulness. 4) To *establish* in a state of grace.

Vers. 1–4. Starke: God does not always keep silent to the sins of the ungodly, but at the proper time sets them before their eyes, Ps. l. 21.—Disselhoff: That is always God's way, first to speak to the sinner in similitudes, in dark sayings, in works and deeds. Dumb preachers, and yet calling so loud! For those similitudes in which the Lord speaks to us contain no unintelligible speech, these trumpets give no uncertain sound.—Cramer: In the office of reproof one must not be too mild, nor yet too sharp, but must so manage that what is said shall be penetrating, shall smite the heart, shall stir and shame the conscience.—[Hall: He that hates sin so much the more as the offender is more dear to him, will let David feel the bruise of his fall. If God's best children have been sometimes suffered to sleep in a sin, at last He hath awakened them in a fright.—Nathan the prophet is sent to the prophet David. Let no man think himself too good to learn; teachers themselves may be taught that, in their own particular, which, in a generality, they have often taught others: it is not only ignorance that is to be removed, but misaffection.—There is no one thing wherein is more use of wisdom, than the due contriving of a reprehension.—Tr.]

Vers. 5. sq. Schlier: We see well the wrong that others do, even if it is only a trifling mote, and how little we care for our own failings, how little we mark our lapses even when it is great beams that we bear in ourselves.—[Hall: How severe justicers we can be to our very own crimes in others.—Tr.]—Wilt thou judge, then judge thyself, and wilt thou be strict, then before all be strict against thyself, and wilt thou be indulgent,

then before all be indulgent towards others, but towards thyself be strict and unindulgent.

Vers. 7 sqq. [HALL: The life of doctrine (teaching) is in the application. We may take pleasure to hear men speak in the clouds—we never take profit till we find a propriety in the exhortation or reproof. There was not more cunning in the parable than cunning in the application: "Thou art the man."—TR.].—DISSELHOFF: He who is used by God to call out to another, "Thou art the man," often does not himself know that he has performed Nathan's service. The Lord sends His word like arrows; so many are struck, in the preaching of the divine word, exactly as if the word had been aimed at their heart alone. It *is* aimed at them too, only not by men, but by God Himself.—S. SCHMID: Every sin is despising God.—CRAMER: Despising the divine word is the evil fountain of all sins (Proverbs xxix. 18).—STARKE: With whatever one sins, with that he is also commonly punished.—SCHLIER: He who insults the word of the Lord, even this word will crush him to atoms, and he who sins against the commandment of God, even this commandment which he has despised will become to him a consuming fire. He who practises injustice and violence shall in his time himself also experience injustice and violence, and he who commits adultery will in his own honor become conscious of God's judgment.—CRAMER: God punishes sin with sin, not that He has pleasure in sin, or that He works it or works with it, but that as a strict Judge, He pronounces sentence and inflicts and permits the evil.

Ver. 13 sq. SCHLIER: He who openly and unreservedly acknowledges himself guilty has thereby inwardly cut himself loose from sin, and broken with it in his heart. — DISSELHOFF: "I have sinned against the Lord." There is in the Bible no confession so unconditional, no expression of repentance so short, but also none so thoroughly true. So long as sin reigns upon the earth, all penitent sinners will with this confession cast themselves down before God, into this confession will they pour out their hearts, this confession will become ever more openly, deeply, truly and movingly their prayer, and they will know how to say nothing else. [HALL: It was but a short word, but passionate; and such as came from the bottom of a contrite heart. The greatest griefs are not most verbal. Saul confessed his sin more largely, less effectually. God cares not for phrases, but for affections. David had sworn, in a zeal of justice, that the rich oppressor, for but taking his poor neighbor's lamb, shall die the death; God, by Nathan, is more favorable to David than to take him at his word, "Thou shalt not die." Comp. Prov. xxviii. 13.—TR.]—CRAMER: God forgives the sin out of grace, and remits also the eternal punishment; but He reserves the cross and the chastisement, not for satisfaction, but in order to continual remembrance of sin and exercise in piety, and as a terror to others.—STARKE [from HALL]: So long as He smites us not as an angry Judge, we may endure to smart from Him as a loving Father (Heb. xii. 6-9).

Ver. 15 sq. J. LANGE: God visits the parents in the children, whether graciously or in wrath. —SCHLIER: There is a distinction between punishment of sin and the outward consequences of sin, which may follow even for him who has forgiveness, only that all this is no longer a punishment of sin, but a gracious, fatherly visitation of the faithful God, who chastens His people even when He loves them, yea, even because of His love and compassion chastens them, that they may not anew fall into sin.—DISSELHOFF: Grace is free, wholly unconditioned. But yet he to whom grace is shown must remain under the chastening rod of the almighty and holy God.—SCHLIER: How should severe sickness in the house be a proof of divine favor? If God the Lord had let every thing at once go on for David according to his desire and will, who knows how soon he would perhaps again have felt secure and have forgotten the Lord who had forgiven his sins? but now that the Lord chastens him, how he learns to pray and weep, how he humbles himself, how he holds all the more faithfully to the Lord and to His word!

Ver. 17 sqq. OSIANDER: Even dear children of God are not always heard, when they pray for temporal gifts and obtain, not what they desire, but what is profitable for them (1 John v. 14).—[HALL: Till we know the determinations of the Almighty, it is free for us to strive in our prayers, to strive with Him, not against Him; when once we know them, it is our duty to sit down in a silent contentation.—TR.]—DISSELHOFF: This is the triumph of grace! It transforms the inevitable consequences of sin and horrors of damnation into a purifying fire, hot indeed, but rich in blessing, in which the objects of grace receive the image and stamp of their Redeemer. [SCOTT: Those who are ignorant of the divine life cannot comprehend the reasons of a believer's conduct in his varied experiences; they mistake deep humility and fervent prayer for an impatience and an inordinate love to created objects; acquiescence in the Lord's will, and cheerful gratitude under sharp trials, will be deemed indifference and apathy, *etc.*—Ver. 23. WESLEY (Sermon CXXXII.): Profuse sorrowing for the dead is unprofitable and sinful; and the text affords a consideration which ought to prevent this sorrow.—TR.]

Ver. 24 sqq. CRAMER: God's promise is the cause of His love towards us, not our merit and worthiness (1 John iv. 10).—SCHLIER: When we have allowed the Lord's chastening to promote our welfare and peace, and are holding still before the Lord, even if we see around us nothing but suffering and trouble, then the Lord takes us up again and blesses us and gives us twofold for all the hardness we have had to endure. The Lord blesses much more willingly than He chastens, His fatherly hands had much rather open in beneficence than in affliction.

DISSELHOFF: *The triumph of grace* in all its glory. It unfolds itself in three steps: 1) Not the fallen one looks up to God, but God's preventing grace in every way lets itself down to him, in order to awaken his conscience. 2) He who lets himself be awakened and openly and unconditionally confesses, receives full and unconditional pardon. 3) The pardoned man must remain under the sharp chastening rod of the Compassionate One, in order that he may learn more and more to know the depths of sin as well as of grace.

[CARLYLE:* David, the Hebrew king, had fallen into sins enough; blackest crimes; there was no want of sins. And thereupon unbelievers sneer and ask, "Is this your man according to God's heart?" The sneer, I must say, seems to me but a shallow one. What are faults? what are the outward details of a life, if the inner secret of it—the remorse, temptations, true, often-baffled, never-ending struggle of it—be forgotten? The deadliest sin were the supercilious consciousness of no sin. David's life and history, as written for us in those Psalms of his, I consider to be the truest emblem ever given of a man's moral progress and warfare here below. All earnest souls will ever discern in it the faithful struggle of an earnest human soul toward what is good and best. Struggle often baffled—sore baffled—driven as into entire wreck, yet a struggle never ended; ever with tears, repentance, true, unconquerable purpose begun anew.—TR.]

CHRYSOSTOM:† David the *prophet*, whose kingdom was in Palestine and temporary, but whose words as a prophet are for the ends of the earth and immortal, fell into adultery and murder—the prophet in adultery, the pearl in the mire. But he did not yet know that he had sinned; so stupefied was he. God sends to him Nathan; the prophet comes to the prophet—just as in the case of physicians, when a physician is sick he needs another physician. Nathan does not at the very door begin to rebuke and upbraid him—that would have made him hardened and shameless. . . . And the king said, "I have sinned against the Lord." He did not say, Why, who art thou that reprovest me? and who sent thee to speak boldly? and how hast thou dared to do this? . . . But precisely in this is that noble man most admirable, that having fallen into the very depths of wickedness, he did not despair nor fling himself prostrate so as to receive from the devil a mortal blow, but quickly and with great vehemence gave a more mortal blow than he received. . . . This history was written not that thou mightest gaze at one who fell, but that thou mightest admire one who rose again; that thou mightest learn, whenever thou hast fallen, how to rise again. For just as physicians select the most grievous diseases and record them in the books, explaining the method of healing them, in order that by exercise in the greater they may easily overcome the lesser diseases, so also God has brought forward the greatest sins in order that they also who commit little offences may through those great examples find the task of correction to be easy.—TR.]

[Ver. 1. *David keeping silence.* Comp. Psalm xxxii. 3, 4. See above, "Hist. and Theol.," No. 1.—Vers. 5, 6. Not only may a guilty man judge severely the crimes of others, but his easy consciousness of guilt may even create an ill-humor that will dispose him to all the greater severity. —Ver. 7. "*Thou art the man.*" One might picture an ungrateful son, a spendthrift, a suicide, *etc.*, and charge each, as to spiritual relations and life, upon the hearer.—TR.]

[Vers. 1–14. *A pattern in reproving.* It is always difficult to reprove with good results, and here the difficulties were peculiarly great. An Oriental king—who has committed a series of enormous crimes, has tried to cover them up, is now moody and irritable. See now the course pursued by the prophet. 1) He approaches the offender *in private.* 2) He uses an affecting *parallel case* to awaken the sense of justice, without arousing suspicion of his design—thus inducing the king to feel, and to express himself very strongly. 3) He suddenly and emphatically *applies* the story, and pours upon the wrong-doer the recital of his crimes. 4) He gladly welcomes confession and penitence, and at once turns from rebuke to comfort.—Ver. 14. "*Great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme.*" 1) Only the *enemies* of the Lord would blaspheme, upon whatsoever occasion. 2) Though the faults of good men are not the cause of blasphemy, it is a great evil to give *occasion* for it. (*a*) The enemies may thus partially delude themselves. (*b*) They will be sure to mislead others. 3) Though there be occasion, yet the comments of God's enemies are *blasphemous.* E. g. (*a*) When they infer that God does not hate sin. (*b*) That God's service makes men no better than they would otherwise be. —TR.]

[Vers. 15–23. *The death of David's child.* 1) The mortal illness of a babe, always so distressing to parents, and in this case having peculiarly distressing conditions. 2) David's persevering prayer, notwithstanding the prophet's prediction. 3) His submission, as soon as he knew the child was dead. 4) His confidence of being reunited with the child hereafter.—TR.]

* "Hero-Worship." Quoted more fully by Taylor.

† Collected and abridged from a number of passing allusions.

3. Breaking up of David's house and family by the crimes of his sons Amnon and Absalom.

CHAPTER XIII. 1–39.

a. Amnon's incest with Tamar. Vers. 1–21.

1 AND it came to pass after this that Absalom the son of David had a fair sister,
2 whose name was Tamar; and Amnon the son of David loved her. And Amnon
was so vexed [troubled][1] that he fell sick for his sister Tamar; for she was a virgin,
3 and Amnon thought it hard for him, to do anything to her. But [And] Amnon
had a friend whose name was Jonadab[2], the son of Shimeah David's brother; and
4 Jonadab was a very subtil man. And he said unto him, Why art thou, *being* the
king's son, lean from day to day [Why art thou so lean, O son of the king, morn-
ing by morning]? wilt thou not tell me? And Amnon said unto him, I love Ta-
5 mar my brother Absalom's sister. And Jonadab said unto him, Lay thee down on
thy bed, and make [feign] thyself sick; and when thy father cometh to see thee,
say unto him, I pray thee, let my sister Tamar come, and give me meat [food[3] to
eat], and dress [prepare] the meat [food[3]] in my sight. that I may see *it* and eat *it*
6 at her hand. So [And] Amnon lay down and made [feigned] himself sick. And
when the king was come [And the king came] to see him, [*ins.* and] Amnon said
unto the king, I pray thee, let Tamar my sister come, and make me a couple of
7 cakes in my sight, that I may eat at her hand. Then [And] David sent home to
Tamar [sent to Tamar to the house], saying, Go now [I pray thee] to thy brother
8 Amnon's house, and dress [prepare] him meat [the food]. So [And] Tamar went
to her brother Amnon's house, and he was laid down; and she took flour [the
9 dough] and kneaded it, and made cakes in his sight, and did bake the cakes. And
she took a [the] pan,[4] and poured *them* out before him; but [and] he refused to
eat. And Amnon said, Have out all men from me. And they went out every man
10 from him. And Amnon said unto Tamar, Bring the meat [food] into the chamber,
that I may eat of [at] thine hand. And Tamar took the cakes which she had
11 made, and brought them into the chamber to Amnon her brother. And when she
had brought [And she handed] *them* unto him to eat, [*ins.* and] he took hold of
12 her, and said unto her, Come lie with me my sister. And she answered [said to]
him, Nay, my brother, do not force [humble] me, for no such thing ought to be

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 2. Impf. Qal. of יָצַר, impersonal construction.—The הִיא in this verse is written הוא in one MS. of Kennicott, which is perhaps an illustration of the fact that this archaic form was not confined to the Pentateuch. —Wellhausen suggests that the Athnach would better stand under אחותו.—TR.]

[2] [Ver. 3. The name *Jonadab* (abbreviated from Jehonadab) means "Jahveh has freely given," as *Jonathan* means "Jahveh has given;" but there is no ground for supposing that the two names (here and xxi. 21) represent the same person (Josephus).—TR.]

[3] [Ver. 5. Two different words are used for "food," the first the ordinary expression (לחם), the second a rarer word (בריה), rendered βρῶμα by the Sept. The word לביבה "cake" is discussed by Erdmann in the Exposition.—TR.]

[4] [Ver. 9. מַשְׂרֵת, an obscure word. It is nearly identical in form with the Chaldee מסרתא "pan," which is the rendering in the Targum of the Heb. מַחֲבַת "pan," and is by some (Cahen) regarded as the Chald. word itself here used instead of the ordinary Heb. word, which is, however, improbable in the Book of Samuel. But while Chald. and Sept. (and Josephus) render it "pan," Syr. and Vulg. regarded it as designating the food that had been prepared: Vulg. *quod coxerat*, Syr. "cakes," and such a meaning would better suit the connection. But no satisfactory etymology has been proposed for it. Geiger's explanation (Urschrift, p. 382), that it is for מַשְׂאֶרֶת (from שְׂאֹר) "unbaked leavened dough" is not in keeping with the statement in ver. 8 that the dough had been baked. The meaning of the word must be left undetermined.—TR.]

31

13 done in Israel; do not thou this folly. And I, whither shall I cause my shame to
go [shall I carry my reproach]? and as for thee, thou shalt be as one of the fools
in Israel. Now, therefore, I pray thee, speak [And now, speak, I pray thee] unto
14 the king; for he will not withhold me from thee. Howbeit [And] he would not
hearken unto her voice, but, being stronger than she, forced her [and he was stronger
15 than she, and humbled her], and lay with her.[5] Then [And] Amnon hated her
exceedingly [with a very great hate]; so that the hatred wherewith he hated her
was greater than the love wherewith he had loved her. And Amnon said unto her,
16 Arise, be gone. And she said unto him, There[6] is no cause; this evil in sending
me away is greater than the other that thou didst unto me. But [And] he would
17 not hearken unto her. Then [And] he called his servant [young man] that minis-
tered[7] unto him, and said, Put now [ye] this *woman* out from me, and bolt the door
18 after her. And she had a garment of divers colours [a long-sleeved garment[8]] upon
her; for with such robes were the king's daughters that were virgins apparelled.
19 Then [And] his servant brought her out, and bolted the door after her. And Ta-
mar put ashes on her head, and rent her garment of divers colours [the long-sleeved
garment] that was on her, and laid her hand on her head, and went on crying
20 [*ins.* as she went]. And Absalom her brother said unto her, Hath Amnon thy bro-
ther been with thee? but hold now thy peace, my sister [and now, my sister, hold
thy peace]; he is thy brother; regard not this thing. So [And] Tamar remained
21 desolate in her brother Absalom's house. But[9] when [And] king David heard of
all these things, [*ins.* and] he was very wroth.

b. Amnon murdered by Absalom. Vers. 22–33.

22 And Absalom spake unto his brother Amnon neither good nor bad; for Absa-
23 lom hated Amnon because he had forced [humbled] his sister Tamar. And it came

[5] [Ver. 14. The אֹתָהּ, pointed in the text as Accus., may be read אִתָּהּ "with her," for which several MSS. read עִמָּהּ; but the Accus. is allowable (later usage, according to Wellhausen).—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 16. The translation of Eng. A. V. is impossible in the present form of the Hebrew text; the text, indeed, gives no sense at all, and must be regarded as corrupt. Dr. Erdmann (changing אַל into אֶל and regarding the sentence as interrupted) renders: "on account of this evil, which is greater than the other, *etc.*," but such a rendering of אֶל־אוֹדוֹת is without authority, and does not fit well with the context. Philippson also, throwing forward the beginning of Tamar's speech, translates: "and she said to him respecting the evil deed, Greater is this than the other, *etc.*," which is intolerably flat. We should naturally regard the אַל as introducing a protest, as in ver. 12; and, changing the אודות into אחי, we obtain the sense (by transposing the Adjective גְּדוֹלָה): "nay, my brother, this evil is greater than the other, *etc.*," which is nearly what the Vat. Sept. (in verse 15) and some other Greek versions (in Montfaucon's Hexapla) give: "nay, my brother, for the last evil is greater than the first, *etc.*" These Greek versions apparently had הָרִאשֹׁנָה instead of הַזֹּאת, so that their text read: אַל אָחִי כִּי גְדוֹלָה הָרָעָה הָאַחֲרֹנָה מֵהָרִאשֹׁנָה אֲשֶׁר. The "this" of our Hebrew text is supported by the Syr. "why doest thou me this grievous evil, *etc.*?" and by the Sept. in ver. 16, which seems, however, to be altered into conformity with the Heb.—Or, following ver. 12 more exactly, we may write: אַל אָחִי אַל־תַּעֲשֶׂה "nay, my brother, do not this evil which is greater, *etc.*;" the text above-given is simpler and more in accordance with the ancient versions.—Some MSS. and printed editions have עַל instead of אל (according to the constant usage with אודות in the O. T.), and this reading is adopted by the *Bib.-Com.*, which renders: "and she spake with him on account of this great wrong in sending me away, greater than the other, *etc.*," supposing that the writer has here blended Tamar's words with his own narrative (so Cahen). But (not to insist that the rendering "spake with him" is impossible) such a blending is improbable, and the phrase "on account of" in general is not in keeping with the context. Fürst takes the word as a substantive, and renders: "let there be no occasion of this evil, *etc.*," which is without support in the usage of the O. T., and is besides very tame.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 17. Sept. "the overseer of his house;" the word is omitted in one MS. of Kennicott, and in one of Pinner's (Thenius).—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 18. So Sept. and other Greek versions, Vulg. and Chaldee (Syr. and Arab. omit the verse). The Greek renderings are καρπωτός and ἀστραγαλωτός.—The מְעִילִים (Eng. A. V. "robes") is somewhat difficult, and various unsatisfactory alterations of the word have been proposed (Wellh.: so the king's daughters . . . were apparelled of old, מֵעוֹלָם). The sentence sounds strange: "she had on a long-sleeved tunic, for so the unmarried princesses wore over-mantles;" but nothing better has been proposed. Böttcher regards it as a gloss.—Tr.]

[9] [Vers. 21, 22. The proposed changes of Böttcher and Thenius are criticised by Erdmann.—Tr.]

to pass after two full years [about[10] two years], that Absalom had sheepshearers in
24 Baal-hezer, which is beside Ephraim; and Absalom invited all the king's sons. And
Absalom came to the king, and said, Behold, now, thy servant hath sheepshearers;
25 let the king, I beseech thee, and his servants go with thy servant. And the king
said unto Absalom, Nay, my son, let us not all now [*om.* now] go, lest we be charge-
able unto thee [burdensome to thee]. And he pressed him; howbeit [and] he would
26 not go, but [and he] blessed him. Then said Absalom [And Absalom said], If not,
I pray thee let my brother Amnon go with us. And the king said unto him, Why
27 should he go with thee? But [And] Absalom pressed him, that [and] he let Am-
28 non and all the king's sons go with him. Now Absalom had commanded [And
Absalom commanded] his servants, saying, Mark ye now when Amnon's heart is
merry with wine, and when I say unto you, Smite Amnon, then kill him, fear not;
29 have not I commanded you? be courageous and be valiant. And the servants of
Absalom did unto Amnon as Absalom had [*om.* had] commanded. Then [And]
30 all the king's sons arose, and every man gat him upon his mule and fled. And it
came to pass, while[11] they were in the way, that tidings came to David, saying, Ab-
31 salom hath slain all the king's sons, and there is not one of them left. Then [And]
the king arose, and tare his garments, and lay on the earth; and all his servants
stood by with their clothes rent. And Jonadab, the son of Shimeah, David's bro-
32 ther, answered and said, Let not my lord suppose [say] that they have slain all the
young men the king's sons; for Amnon only is dead; for by the appointment of
Absalom this hath been determined from the day that he forced [humbled] his sis-
33 ter Tamar. Now therefore [And now] let not my lord the king take the thing to
his heart, to think that [saying], All the king's sons are dead; for Amnon only is
dead.

c. *Absalom's flight.* Vers. 34–39.

34 But [And][13] Absalom fled. And the young man that kept the watch lifted up
his eyes and looked, and behold, there came much people by the way of the hill-
35 side behind[12] him. And Jonadab said unto the king, Behold, the king's sons come;
36 as thy servant said, so it is. And it came to pass, as soon as he had made an end
of speaking, that behold the king's sons came, and lifted up their voice and wept;
37 and the king also and all his servants wept very sore. But [And][13] Absalom fled
and went to Talmai the son of Ammihud, king of Geshur. And *David* mourned
38 for his son every day. So [And][13] Absalom fled, and went to Geshur, and was
39 there three years. And *the soul of* king David longed to go forth unto Absalom;
for he was comforted concerning Amnon, seeing he was dead.

[10] [Ver. 23. Literally: "unto two years days," a common mode of expression in Heb. (see Lex. *s. v.* יֶרַח חֹדֶשׁ) the general designation of time being defined more precisely by the addition of the simplest unit "day."—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 30. Absolute construction, corresponding to the Abl. Absol. in Latin. Lit.: "and it came to pass, they on the way, and the news came, *etc.*"—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 34. Erdmann (after Thenius) renders: "from the West," referring to Ex. iii. 1 compared with Isa. ix. 11; Job xxiii. 8, in none of which passages, however, has the word a suffix as here; and the present Heb. form is suspicious because the anarthrous דֶּרֶךְ (way), as construct, would naturally require a substantive after it. Moreover, the Sept., Syr. and Vulg. here show important deviations from the Heb. The Syr. omits this word (אחריו), the Vulg. renders it with *devium*, and the Sept. (adding to our text) has: "and behold, much people were coming in the way behind him on the side of the mountain on the declivity (ἐν τῇ καταβάσει), and the watchman came and told the king and said, I have seen men on the way of Oronen on the side (μέρους) of the mountain." As to this addition it is hard to say whether it belongs to the original text, or is an explanatory insertion; it fills out the narrative very naturally, but this is itself a suspicious fact, and the words spoken by the watchman might certainly be a variant translation of the same Heb. as lies at the basis of the statement in ver. 34 (in the Hebrew). However this may be (Thenius, Böttcher and Wellhausen accept the addition), the Oronen of the Sept. points to Horon or Horonaim, a well-known place on the neighboring mountain, and the phrase "on the declivity" is thus explained as referring to the declivitous side of the hill (and so the Vulg. *devium*, Heb. מוֹרָד). We thus reach the rendering "by the way of Horonaim (Beth-horon) on the side of the mountain," which is syntactically and geographically satisfactory; and need suppose only that חֹרֹנַיִם has been altered in the masoretic text into אחריו. The addition in the Sept. may be a marginal explanation (it is not found in the Vulg.), and its first clause may be altered into conformity with the existing Heb. text; the ἐν τῇ καταβάσει may belong to the original form (Vulg. *devium*), and the "on the side of the mountain" may be an explanation of this original or marginal. At any rate the change of אחריו to חרנים is altogether probable.—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 38. The repetition of the statement that Absalom fled is striking, and the narrative vers. 36-38 is not clear and natural in arrangement. We should rather expect 37 *b* (in which no subject is expressed) to follow 36, and 38 makes 37 *a* unnecessary. So the first clause of 34 seems out of place. But, while it is hard to justify the present arrangement on logical grounds, the unnecessary repetitions may result from the fact that we have the outline of an originally longer narrative wherein these repeated statements would not be out of place. The order of the masoretic text is sustained by the versions. In ver. 37 after Geshur (Γεδσούρ) Sept. adds εἰς γῆν χαμμαχάδ, which Thenius accepts as representing an original Heb. "land of Maacah" (Böttcher: land of his mother Maacah), and Wellh. rejects because of the Art. (χα — הַ) and because of the absence of the word "mother."—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1–21. *Amnon's crime.** Ver. 1. sqq. **And it came to pass after this**—general chronological statement, referring what follows to the time after the Ammonite war. *Tamar* and Absalom were the children of Maacah, daughter of Talmai king of Geshur, whom David had married after he ascended the throne at Hebron (iii. 3). *Amnon* was David's oldest son; his mother was the Jezreelitess Ahinoam (iii. 2). The apodosis begins with the words: "and Amnon was so troubled" (ver. 2), while ver. 1 from **and Absalom** to the end is explanatory parenthesis.—Ver. 2. Literally: *it was strait to Amnon unto becoming sick*, that is, he was sore troubled, so that he fell sick. Not: "feigned himself sick" (Luther), for he does not feign till vers. 5, 6 (where the word is properly so rendered). [Ewald (quoted by Thenius) remarks that Amnon's character and conduct were doubtless affected by the fact that he was the first-born son, and of a mother apparently not of the noblest birth.—Tr.] We have a picture here of the consuming fire of passionate love, which could not be satisfied, because **Tamar was a virgin and it seemed to him impossible to do anything to her**, that is, her maidenly reserve and her inaccessibility [in the harem or women's apartment] or other difficulties thwarted his designs.—Vers. 3 sq. By his wicked, crafty cousin *Jonadab*, the son of his uncle Shimeah (another son of whom, Jonathan, is mentioned xxi. 21) Amnon is not only strengthened in his sinful desire, but is shown a way whereby he may attain his end by guile and violence. He becomes "lean," an appearance all the more striking in a "king's son," in whose case there was no reason for it. **From morning to morning**—his aspect was more wretched in the morning after nights made sleepless by torturing passion. [Thenius: a finely chosen point in the description of his malady, from which also it appears that Jonadab was, if not a house-mate, at least his daily companion. *Bib. Com.*: he mentions the morning because it was his custom to come to Amnon every morning to his levee.—Tr.] This wretched appearance of his favored the advice *to feign himself sick* (ver. 5). **To see thee**, "seeing" used for *visiting the sick* (Ps. xli. 7 (6); 2 Kings viii. 29). Jonadab's counsel takes for granted that the father will not refuse the sick son such a request. From the whole account we see that the king's children dwelt in different households. "Probably each wife with her children dwelt in a separate part of the royal palace" (Keil), and further the grown sons, as appears from vers. 7 and 20, had each his separate house. "A couple of cakes;" some solid, distinctly shaped preparation is here meant, since there were "two" of them. Whether it received its name from its *heart*-like shape, or its heart-strengthening power (Keil), [the word is *lebibah*, and the Heb. for "heart" is *leb*], or because it was made from *rolled* dough,† is left undecided. Tamar was probably famed for her skilful cooking. [In the East such skill is not unusual, even in women of high rank.—Tr.]

Vers. 8 sqq. "She took a *pan* [ver. 9], so Chald. and Sept. [On the word rendered "pan" see "Text. and Gram.;" it seems more probable that it is a name for some preparation of food —Tr.] "Baked" [ver. 8]; the Heb. word (בשל) is used for roasting or baking, see Ex. xii. 9 comp. with 2 Chr. xxxv. 13. Amnon's *refusal* to eat must have conveyed the impression that he was very sick, and the exclusion of all persons from the room might be easily explained by the fact that he was weakened by his illness. He was as clever an actor as Jonadab a crafty counsellor.—Vers. 12 sqq. Tamar's noble conduct in rejecting this wicked proposal is a confirmation of what is said in ver. 2 of the hindrances in Amnon's way. **Such things are not done in Israel**, it is against the law and custom of the people of God (as contrasted with the heathen). Comp. Lev. xx. 17 with vers. 7 and 26. Tamar repels the wickedness from the highest moral point of view, which is determined by the theocratic-national position and significance of Israel. The word "folly" (נְבָלָה) is here used of unchastity as in xxxiv. 7. [The same sense is given substantially by the rendering of Eng. A. V.: "not so should it be done in Israel" (as Philippson).—Keil remarks that the expression recalls Gen. xxxiv. 7 (where it is a commentary on Shechem's conduct to Dinah), the words being the same; and *Bib. Com.* adds that Tamar probably knew the passage in Genesis, and wished to profit by it. But, as this passage is a remark of the Editor of the Pentateuch (as the phrase "*in Israel*" shows), and it is doubtful whether the Pentateuch in its present shape existed in David's time, the resemblance between the two passages must be otherwise explained. The phrase in question may have been a common one, or the Editor of Genesis may have taken it from our narrative, as a remark appropriate in his narrative.—Tr.]—Next to the *honor of Israel* as the people sanctifying itself to the Lord, she adduces her own honor and Amnon's (ver. 13); both, she would say, will suffer irreparable shame. Further, in order more certainly to hold him off, she urges him to ask her in marriage of the king, who would not deny his request. This would be in opposition to the law, Lev. xviii. 9; xx. 17; Deut. xxvii. 22, whereby sexual connections between brothers and sisters (those having only one parent in common are especially mentioned) are strictly forbidden. In order to harmonize this apparent contradiction Thenius thinks it not impossible that the prohibitions in Lev. xviii. 7–18; xx. 19–21; Deut. xxvii. 20, 22 referred first to the maintenance of moral purity in family-life, and that they did not wholly forbid real marriages between brothers and sisters (having only one parent in common), particularly where there was special inclination. But this view cannot be well made to accord with the absoluteness of the prohibition and the sharpness of the threat of punishment. The strict prohibition of sexual connection in general must have applied to marriage also. It must be supposed either that the law was not strictly carried out, or that Tamar, knowing

* [From this point to xxiii. 7 (and ch. xi. except ver. 1) is omitted in Chron., it not entering into the design of that Book to record the merely individual history of David, but only his theocratic and ritual acts.—Tr.]

† Böttcher: from Arab. לבב, Chald. לפף, Heb. לוח.

the law very well, wished to keep back the passionate advances of Amnon. So Josephus [7, 8, 1]: "this she said, wishing to escape his passion for the present," and Clericus: "that she might elude him in every way possible, lest, if all hope of marriage were denied, the man should be the more incited to violence."*

Ver. 15. On the satisfaction of sexual desire follows *hate* towards its object and instrument; "a psychological trait," remarks Thenius, "that vouches for the truth of the narrative."—Ver. 16. Tamar's reply is not to be rendered (Vulg., Luther): "the evil is greater than the other," for the Heb. requires: "this great (greater) evil." Nor can we (with Thenius) alter the Heb. text after the Sept.: "nay, my brother (אַל־אָחִי), for the evil is greater,"† *etc.*, which is obviously a change to avoid difficulty, and the consequent change of text is too violent. The renderings: "give no occasion of this greater evil" (Cler., Ges.), and: "but not this greater evil than the other!" (De Wette) do not accord with the wording of the Heb. Böttcher, by two changes (עַל for אַל, and insertion of מָה), gets the sense: "wherefore this great evil, greater than . . . ?"; on which Thenius rightly remarks that it is difficult to see why the narrator should have put this *unintelligible* phrase into the mouth of *the unfortunate woman* rather than the simple "why?" (מַדּוּעַ or לָמָּה).—It certainly seems better (if anything is to be added) to insert the word "let there be" or "be thou" (תְּהִי), so that it shall read: "become not the cause of this great evil, which is greater than . . . ." (Maur., Dietrich in *Ges. Lex. s. v.* אוֹדוֹת); but this expression also: "become not the cause" is not simple and natural enough in the mouth of the excited Tamar. It is better to suppose an unfinished sentence and render (changing אַל into אֶל־): **On account of this greater evil . . .** she is interrupted by Amnon, and cannot finish her address. This is clear from what immediately follows: **But he would not hear her, and said to his servant, Put her out from me**; he ordered her to be put out before she could finish. This expulsion was a still "greater evil" than the other violence done her, both for her, because it would create the impression that she had done something shameful, and for him, since he thus added wrong to wrong. [On this reading see "Text. and Gram.," where reasons are given for adopting substantially the text of the Sept.: "nay, my brother, for this evil is greater," *etc.* The objection to Dr. Erdmann's rendering is the same that he has himself urged against another: it is too formal, too little in keeping with the excited state in which we should suppose Tamar to be. A similar objection applies to the translation given in the *Bib. Com.*—Tr.] Ver. 17. [*Amnon orders Tamar to be expelled.*] This order and conduct must have led the servant to suppose that she had done something shameful.—[*Bib. Com.:* The brutality of Amnon needs no comment.—Tr.]—Ver. 18. [*Tamar is expelled.*] She had on a garment with long sleeves (פַּסִּים); the usual undergarment covered only the upper arm, while this covered the whole arm, and took the place of the armless *meil* [outer garment or robe.] Translate: **thus were the king's daughters, the virgins, clothed with robes**; such long-sleeved mantles distinguished the princesses.—Ver. 19. Her indication of grief at the shame done her. The hands clasped above the head or laid on the head, are a sign of grief at the shame that has come on the head as the bearer of one's personal honor. Comp. Jer. ii. 37. [Ver. 18 *b* would seem to connect itself more naturally with ver. 17, and ver. 18 *a* with ver. 19. It may be, as Keil says, that her royal dress is mentioned to bring out more clearly the harshness of her treatment, since the servant must have recognized the dress. The word "robes" in ver. 18 is discussed in "Text. and Gram.;" the sentence would perhaps be helped by omitting the word.—*Bib. Com.* suggests that Tamar took the ashes that she put on her head from the very place where she had cooked the food for Amnon.—Tr.]—Ver. 20. [*Absalom cares for his sister.*] Instead of "Amnon" the Heb. has *Aminon*, a diminutive, expressive of scorn and contempt.* Absalom's question shows that a suspicion of Amnon naturally suggested itself to him: **Has Aminon thy brother been with thee?** euphemism for Amnon's deed. Absalom, with his careless exhortation: **lay not this thing to heart**, is a sad comforter. [More probably, under this careless exterior he concealed a deep purpose to avenge the crime, which he at this moment had neither words nor inclination to discuss. He seems not to have failed in his duty to his sister.—Tr.]—**And Tamar abode in his house as a desolated woman**; literally, "and as desolated," not "as solitary."—Ver. 21. [*David's anger.*] After the words: "and he was very wroth," the Sept. adds: "and he grieved not the spirit of Amnon his son, because he loved him, because he was his first-born." But this addition gives too circumstantial and full a reason why David contented himself with being angry and did not punish Amnon; we cannot alter the Heb. text to accord with it (as Then. and Ewald do). David's failure to inflict on Amnon the legal penalty of death [Lev. xx. 17] was a sign of weakness, and led to Absalom's revenge and his rebellion against his father. — Ver. 22. [*Absalom's hatred of Amnon.*]—**From bad to good**, neither bad nor good (Gen. xxiv. 50), he talked not at all with him because he hated him.—There is no need with Böttcher to transpose vers. 21 and 22. Verse 20 having described

* [Bp. Patrick mentions an (unfounded) Jewish opinion that Tamar was born of Maacah while the latter was a captive (Deut. xxi. 10 sqq.), that is, before she became a proselyte and David's wife, and that Tamar was therefore legally not Amnon's sister.—Probably both the explanations suggested above by Erdmann are correct; the Levitical code was hardly observed with strictness at this time.—Tr.]

† [Thenius here writes μεγάλη ἡ κακία, but Tischendorf has μείζων.—Tr.]

* [So Böttcher and Thenius, after the analogy of the Arabic, in which a diminutive is formed by inserting a letter (Yod) after the second radical; but the diminutive form is doubtful here, partly because the ancient versions (Arabic included) except Chaldee do not here follow the Heb., but give the form *Amnon;* the reading here may be a clerical error (so Wellhausen and *Bib. Com.*).—Tr.]

Absalom's procedure (in connection with Amnon's crime) and ver. 21 the king's, ver. 22 begins a new section, in which is first stated the deepest ground of Absalom's conduct towards Amnon afterwards related, namely, his hate towards him. The present order of verses therefore presents the thoroughly well-arranged progress in the narrative, which Thenius thinks can be attained only by a transposition.

b. Vers. 22–33. *Amnon's murder by Absalom.*—Ver. 22 is closely connected with ver. 23 sq., giving the ground of Absalom's fratricide, though two years elapse before the act of vengeance is executed. According to verse 23 Absalom had an *estate* in *Baalhazor near Ephraim.* Probably also the other sons of the king had such landed possessions. A joyful *festival* was connected with *sheepshearing* (comp. 1 Sam. xxv. 2, 8), as is not seldom the case also in Germany. *Baal-hazor* is more exactly described as being *near Ephraim.* This cannot mean near the *tribe*-territory of Ephraim; the Prep. "*near*" (עִם) shows that a *city* called Ephraim is meant (2 Chron. xiii. 19 Qeri, comp. Josh. xv. 9; John xi. 54; Joseph., *bell. Jud.* 4, 9. 9, according to Eusebius eight miles north of Jerusalem). Thenius: "probably Tell Asur south of Shiloh; see Käuffer, *Stud.* II. 145."*—Ver. 25. He blessed him, *i. e.* wished him well (בֵּרֵךְ as in 1 Sam. xxv. 14).—Ver. 26. "If *thou* goest not," literally: "and not;" so Sept. and Vulg. But Thenius renders: "O that Amnon might go with us" (taking לֹא = לוּ, Ew., § 358 *b*). The king, unwilling to go himself,† is also unwilling for Amnon to go, as the question: "why should he go with thee?" shows. For he could not be ignorant of Absalom's hatred to Amnon. [Thenius: "let Amnon, the first-born [and heir-apparent] go along with us (me and the other princes) as thy representative."—Thus David found it hard to deny Absalom's request without giving as a reason what he was unwilling to say.—Tr.]—Ver. 27. [*David consents.*] David here also shows himself weak in yielding to Absalom's request.—As our narrator is only concerned to tell how the fratricide was accomplished, he omits mention of the meal that Absalom prepared, especially as this was indirectly given in vers. 23, 24. The addition of the Sept.: "and Absalom prepared a repast like the repast of a king," is to be regarded, therefore, as a mere explanatory insertion.‡—Ver. 28 sqq. [*The murder.*] As David had weakly left Amnon's crime unpunished, Absalom held it his duty to take vengeance on Amnon and maintain his sister's honor. This feeling does not, however, exclude the motive of selfish ambition in Absalom; by the death of Amnon he would be one step nearer to the succession to the throne; there may, indeed, have been another brother, Chileab, older than he (iii. 3), but probably (to judge from Absalom's conduct, xv. 1–6) he was no longer alive. Absalom's ambition, which afterwards led him into rebellion, probably welcomed this pretext for putting Amnon, the heir to the throne, out of the way. Comp. Winer, *R.-W.* I. 14.—Ver. 29. [*Flight of the princes.*] "Every man on his *mule.*" Mule-breeding is forbidden in Lev. xix. 19. [Yet mules were frequently used by persons of distinction, Absalom (2 Sam. xviii. 9), David and Solomon (1 Kings i. 33; x. 25), and were probably introduced by commerce or war. Our passage contains the first mention of them; afterwards they seem to have become common (1 Kings xviii. 5; Zech. xiv. 15; Ezra ii. 66). Ewald thinks that the law in Lev. does not forbid breeding them; certainly it does not absolutely forbid owning them. See Art. *Maulthier* in Herzog.—Tr.]—Ver. 30. **Tidings came,** namely, by the servants, who had come on in advance of the princes. The exaggeration in their report is psychologically easily explained by the circumstances.—Ver. 31. [*The king's grief.*] The king's servants stood still, immovable (נִצָּבִים), comp. Num. xxii. 32 sq.; Deut. v. 20. It need not be inferred from the phrase: **And all his servants stood before him with garments rent,** that the courtiers preceded the king in the rending of the garments (Böttcher), since this rending on their part would naturally follow on the king's, and did not require special mention.—[Sept.: "and all his servants that were standing about him rent their garments," which represents an easy and natural Hebrew; but there is not sufficient ground for altering the Heb. text to accord with it.—Tr.]—Ver. 32 sqq. *Jonadab*, who had counselled Amnon to commit his crime, now *corrects* the false report [sharp-sightedly seeing how the thing must be.—Tr.], and gives a reason for his assertion that Amnon alone was dead:* for on **Absalom's mouth was it laid** (it lay) **from the day**; that is, one could infer from his words that he intended this (De Wette), or, better: "one could see it in him; for the movements of the soul are seen (next to the look) most clearly about the mouth" (Thenius). The subject of the verb "was" [Eng. A. V. *this*], namely, the murder of Amnon, or hatred to Amnon, naturally suggests itself, and the omission is in accordance with Jonadab's excited, hurried speech. His purpose was set, *determined* (שִׂימָה), comp.

* Böttcher: "The name אֶפְרַיִם is probably from עֶפְרִים or עֶפְרֹין." Thenius: "If the tribe Ephraim were meant, it would read: 'which pertains to' (אֲשֶׁר לְ) (comp. 1 Sam. xvii. 1; 1 Chron. xiii. 6), not 'near' (עִם), Vulg. *juxta Ephraim*, and see Gen. xxxv. 4 and *especially* Josh. vii. 2."—[Mr. Grove, in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, thinks that three different places are meant in John xi. 54; 2 Sam. xviii. 6 and 2 Chron. xiii. 19, and does not identify our Ephraim with any of them; there is, he says, no clew to its situation.—Tr.]

† [Kitto (*Dai. Bib. Ill.*) remarks that David's reason in ver. 25 is the first intimation in history of the ruinous expense of royal visits, and mentions the case of the Hoghton family in Lancashire, said to have been ruined by a visit from King James I.—Tr.]

‡ [Thenius (followed by Wellh.) accepts this addition as a part of the original text because of its naturalness, holding the reason for its omission from the Heb. to be the similar ending of the two clauses (הַמֶּלֶךְ, here and in ver. 27). But Erdmann's argument against this elucidatory statement is just and entitled to consideration.—Tr.]

* [Some VSS. and EDD. have "my lord the king," instead of "my lord;" and some read כִּי, "for," instead of כִּי אִם, "but." In such particles the text is uncertain.—Tr.]

Ex. xxi. 13; his determination to do the deed lay on his mouth, was decidedly and clearly stamped in the features about his mouth. Vulg.: "in hatred," instead of "in the mouth;" Aq., Sym.: "in wrath" (they read אַפִּי instead of פִּי).* [If our Hebrew text is retained, the rendering of Eng. A. V. is in accordance with the general usage of the words: "according to the commandment of Absalom it was determined from the day," *etc.*, where the difficulty is to say what was determined and to whom the commandment was given. On the other hand, it is not probable (as Erdmann's rendering asserts) that Absalom openly showed his purpose to kill his brother; in that case the latter would have been warned. The general meaning, however, is clear, that Absalom had made up his mind two years before to kill Amnon.—Tr.]

c. Vers. 34-39. *Absalom's flight.*—Ver. 34. **And Absalom fled.** There is no ground for attaching these words to Jonadab's speech, ver. 33 (Mich., Dathe), since the latter could not have known of Absalom's flight, and it is not a mere surmise about it that is expressed, but the *fact.* From ver. 29 on two lines of narration must be distinguished. The one, starting with the flight of David's sons (ver. 29), gives the rumor, the fact affirmed by Jonadab and its impression on David, up to ver. 33; the other, pointing back to ver. 29, begins with Absalom's flight (synchronous with that of the princes), and proceeds to tell of the arrival of the other sons after Absalom's flight. The sentence: "And Absalom fled," certainly breaks the connection, since the next sentence ("the watchman lifted up his eyes") is closely connected with ver. 33. But the words are not taken from ver. 37, as has been assumed; the object of this interruption is to bring forward the important event that preceded the arrival of the sons of David, so that on the one hand Absalom's flight and absence from the royal court, on the other hand the presence of his brothers and their complaint to their father are the subject-matter of the narration, which closes with the goal of Absalom's flight and David's conduct in respect to Absalom and the death of Amnon.—Ver. 34. **The young man, the watchman,** who was looking out for the persons returning from the festival. **Much people,** a crowd of people made up of the numerous retinue of the sons of David. "From the way *behind him,*" that is, "according to well-known *usus loquendi* (see Ex. iii. 1 comp. with Isa. ix. 11; Job xxiii. 8) simply *from the west*" (Thenius), since *in front* means geographically the East. "From the side of the mountain," probably Mount Zion. The princes came not from the north, but from the west, because the return by this route was easier and quicker.—Ver. 35. Jonadab confirms his previous assertion.—Ver. 36. Repetition of the mourning of ver. 31, only deeper.—Ver. 37. The narrative returns to Absalom, resuming the statement of his flight (from ver. 34); this repetition is occasioned by the preceding remark: "the king's sons came." The sense is: "except Absalom, who had fled." On Talmai see iii. 3. Absalom's stay with him lasted three years. [On the text of vers. 34-38 see "Text. and Gram." The conclusion there reached is that the order in our present text cannot be defended, there being no visible reason for the repetitions, and the omission of the subject (David) in 37 *b* being impossible if that clause were in its proper position, but that our present text may be the abridgement of a longer narrative, in which the repetitions were not out of place, and the omission of subject not improper.—Tr.]

Ver. 39. **And David the king* held back from going forth against Absalom, for he had consoled himself for Amnon, that he was dead.**—The construction being impersonal [it restrained=David was restrained], no subject is to be supplied, as "grief restrained" (Maurer), or: "Absalom's flight to Geshur and his abode there restrained" (Keil); for the reason of his not going out after Absalom lay in his tone of feeling, as indicated in the words: "for he had consoled himself." This was his ground of action, not sorrow for Absalom's flight, and this accords with the capacity for rapid change of his sanguine temperament; his hot anger soon sank into quiet. Comp. ver. 21 and xii. 20-24. The rendering: "And David longed to go forth to Absalom" (Chald., the Rabbis, De W. in the Remarks) supposes the insertion of the word *soul* (נֶפֶשׁ) after the verb (so Eng. A. V.] But (apart from the hardness of this insertion) there are two objections to this rendering, namely, that David could have sent for Absalom, if he wanted him, and that, so far from feeling any love-longing towards Absalom, David was permanently set against him, as appears from the fact that, after

---

* [The common Vulg. text has "in the mouth (*in ore*) of Absalom." The Syr.: "it was fixed (שִׂימָה) in the purpose of Absalom," confirms the Heb. as a free rendering, while the Chald.: "treachery (waylaying) was in the heart of Absalom," seems to take the שִׂימָה ("laid") as a substantive (=זִמָּה, Thenius). Hence Ewald would read it שִׂטְמָה [an unknown word]—"look of revenge," and Wellhausen takes our word (from the Arab. root=*sinister fuit*) as a substantive—"sinister expression." A substantive as subject would naturally be expected here, but the proposed emendations are hardly satisfactory. Following the Chald. we might read: "on the heart of Absalom was laid this thing," *etc.*, which (by inserting the words "this thing") would correspond with the following clause. But this conjecture is not sufficiently supported by external authority.—Tr.]

* "David the king," instead of the usual (Sept., Vulg.) "king David" (comp. Ges., § 113, Rem.). [Some take the דָּוִד here, on account of its unusual position (but see 1 Sam. xviii. 6), to be a corruption of some other word meaning grief, soul, or the like.—Tr.]—וַתְּכַל from כלה=כלא, "to prevent" (Maur., Keil), "these two verbs often interchanging." As the 3 pers. masc. is often impersonal [וַיֵּצֶר לוֹ], so sometimes the 3 pers. fem. (1 Sam. xxx. 6; Ps. l. 3; comp. Ges., § 137, 2). וַתְּכַל therefore here="and it hindered him." [To this impersonal construction there are two syntactical objections: 1) the substantive idea of the verb is active instead of neuter, and in any case we should expect the object (דוד) to be introduced by a preposition; 2) the Inf. after כלא is properly introduced by מִן instead of לְ as here. Maurer renders: "it restrained him," *i. e.* grief; others: "David restrained [his servants]," which the form of the verb (fem.) does not permit.—Tr.]

Joab had gotten him back, it was two years before the king would see him (xiv. 24, 28). Ewald* renders: "David's anger ceased to express itself about Absalom." But the verb (תֵּצֵא) cannot be so translated, and the insertion [of the word *anger*] is arbitrary and violent. Böttcher's* translation: "and David left off going." *etc.*, supposes that he had begun to go, and was stopped by obstacles, which is nowhere intimated. The same objection lies to Thenius'* rendering: "he desisted from going out" (after having begun), time having softened his grief; but nothing is said of this in the connection. [The impersonal construction (of Erdmann and others) cannot be maintained here, and the Heb. text in its present shape gives no sense. We must either adopt the rendering of Eng. A. V. supplying the word *soul*, or (after Ewald) supply some such word as *anger*. David's feeling towards Absalom here indicated is apparently a kindly one, since it is probably what Joab is said in xiv. 1 to perceive, and in this latter verse it is a kindly feeling (Dr. Erdmann takes a different view). The sense, then, seems to be as follows: David longed to recall Absalom, but political and judicial reasons deterred him; Joab perceives this, and helps the king out of the difficulties that his sense of justice threw in the way of the exhibition of his love for his exiled son.—Tr.]

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. "The sins of the fathers are visited on the children." The truth of this moral law is illustrated in the history of David's family. The divine threat uttered by Nathan (xii. 7–12) begins here to be fulfilled in the disintegration of David's family-life. As he destroyed the honor and happiness of Uriah's house, so his first-born son brings shame on his; as he committed murder, so the sword dooms his child. One sin led to another; the bitter spring of sin grew in time to a river of destruction that flowed over the whole land, and even endangered David's throne and life (Baumgarten).

2. The fratricide Absalom is a transgressor of God's command, infringing by his self-avenging the divine arrangement whereby sin and sinner meet with their judgment. On the other hand, God controls Absalom's crime, and by it punishes Amnon's crime. Absalom is God's instrument, though not himself less guilty. The Lord uses men's sins according to His pleasure; human unrighteousness must serve the ends of His righteousness.

3. Right family-discipline consists in enforcing God's holy laws in the control of children, and carelessness in this causes sin to grow quietly, till the evil bursts suddenly forth and destroys the happiness of the household. But when evil makes its appearance God's law requires strict chastisement, wherein David failed towards both Amnon and Absalom. This neglect, usually the result of weak affection (and in David's case induced also by the recollection of his own sin), leads to still greater sins and crimes in the family.

4. These dreadful experiences of David and his sons are intended to lead him to purity, humility and sanctification. "He that thinks all this a sign of God's wrath and disfavor knows little of what it means to have forgiveness of sins. David confessed his sins, and so found favor with the Lord his God. But how wholesome for him was the Lord's chastisement now, how he needed constant self-humbling, and what better for this end than these bitter experiences of his family? Whom the Lord loves He chastens" (Schlier). "Forgiveness of sin usually merely converts punishment into paternal chastisement, the rod of anger into the smiting of love. Externally the consequences of sin remain the same, only their internal character is changed. Otherwise forgiveness of sin might too easily lead to wilfulness" (Hengstenb. *Gesch. d. Reiches Gottes* [Hist. of the Kingdom of God], II. 127).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1. Osiander: Even though God forgives the sin, nevertheless He lays upon the sinner a cross, that he may be more heedful, and his neighbor may be deterred from sin (Num. xiv. 20–23).—Ver. 2. Starke: Where the parents live in sin, the children commonly follow after (1 Kings xv. 1–3).—[Henry: Godly parents have often been afflicted with wicked children; grace does not run in the blood, but corruption does. We do not find that David's children imitated him in his devotion; but his false steps they trod in, and in those did much worse, and repented not.—Wordsworth: He was forgiven by God, but they came to a miserable end.—Scott: So depraved is the human heart, that even natural affection may degenerate into licentiousness; and the intercourse even between near relations should be conducted with caution and prudence, that no opportunity may be given to those who are disposed to commit iniquity.—Tr.]—Osiander: The more one thinks about an unchaste love, the greater it becomes.

Vers. 3–5. Cramer: Lust punishes itself, consumes the marrow in the bones, shortens life, and ruins one's good name (Ecclus. xxiii. 22).—J. Lange: One man is another's angel, a good angel for warning, and so for seduction an evil angel.—[Hall: Had Jonadab been a true friend, he had bent all the forces of his dissuasion against the wicked motions of that sinful lust; had showed the prince of Israel how much those lewd desires provoked God, and blemished himself, and had lent his hand to strangle them in their first conception. There cannot be a more worthy improvement of friendship, than in a fervent opposition to the sins of them whom we profess to love.—Tr.]

Ver. 10. Starke: The ungodly are ashamed only before men, not before God (Ecclus. xxiii. 25 sq.).—Seb. Schmid: He who wishes to guard against sinning with others, should not follow them where he may be constrained to sin.—Hedinger: Unrighteous works always seek to remain concealed (Prov. vii. 18–20).—Vers. 15–17. Starke [from Hall]: Inordinate lust never ends but in discontent. . . . . Brutish Amnon, it was thyself whom thou shouldst have hated for this villainy, not thine innocent sister. O how

---

* Ewald: וַתְּכַל חֲמַת דָּוִד לָצֵאת עַל־אַבְשָׁלוֹם; Böttcher: וַתְּכַל לְדָוִד; Thenius: וַיְּחַל.

many brothers of Amnon there are even to-day.—[SCOTT: It cannot reasonably be expected that those who make no scruple of debauching the persons of those for whom they *pretend affection*, will feel any remorse at deserting them with cruelty and disdain, at exposing them to shame and contempt, or at leaving them to all the horrors of penury and prostitution. Let none ever expect better treatment from those who are capable of attempting to seduce them.—TR.]

Ver. 21. WUERT. B.: While parents should love their children, yet they must not spare them when they have done evil, but bring them to due punishment, that they may not have to be punished by God or by the executioner (1 Sam. ii. 29).—[HALL: The better-natured and more gracious a man is, the more subject he is to the danger of an over-remissness, and the excess of favor and mercy.—WORDSWORTH: David was wroth, but did not punish his son Amnon; being conscious of the sin which he had himself committed, and by which he had tempted his children to sin. And because the king did not execute justice, therefore Absalom, Tamar's brother, takes the law into his own hands, and murders his brother Amnon. Thus one sin leads to another by an almost endless chain of consequences.—TR.]—J. LANGE: It is very important that persons in authority, teachers and fathers of families should lead such a life that in punishing others they may not have to fear reproach, and thereby be restrained.—SCHLIER: What is to become of a house, in which father and mother, in the consciousness of their own faults, no longer venture to do their duty?

Vers. 28 sq. SCHLIER: The Lord our God has everything in His hand; He uses even the sin of men according to His will, He punishes one transgressor through another, He chastens one wrong-doer through the wrong-doing of another. The Lord's mighty hand comes into the common course of the world, and the execution of His judgments goes on right through the midst of the unrighteousness of men.—Always does that remain true which is written: Be not deceived, God is not mocked; sin remains always and everywhere the ruin of peoples.—Vers. 36 sq. OSIANDER: By new attacks and afflictions God brings to His people's mind their before committed sins, in order that they may the more earnestly go forward in a penitent life.—CRAMER: Next to experience of the wrath of God there is no sorer pain under heaven, than when parents come to have such heart-sorrow in their children as to doubt of their souls' salvation, xviii. 33.

[*Amnon*. (This might be addressed to an assembly of men alone.) 1) An improper love. 2) Brooding over a sinful attachment till unhappy (ver. 2). 3) In cherishing a sinful desire, one meets temptation to indulge it (vers. 3–5). 4) Unmanly deception and unnatural crime (vers. 6–14). 5). Sinful love sooner or later turning to hate and disgust (vers. 15–18). 6) Licentiousness often leads to other crimes and great calamities (vers. 28, 29).—*A miserable father*. 1) He has been obliged to leave unpunished a disgraceful crime in his house (ver. 21). 2) This has given excuse to a headstrong and ambitious son to murder his brother. 3) Rumor, accepted by his fears, has greatly magnified the calamity (ver. 30). 4) He knows these terrible events to be deserved chastisements for his own former misconduct (xii. 10, 11).—TR.]

---

4. *David's Weakness towards Joab and Absalom. Absalom's Return and Reconciliation with David through Joab's Intercession.*

CHAP. XIV. 1–33.

1 Now [And] Joab the son of Zeruiah perceived that the king's heart was toward[1]
2 Absalom. And Joab sent to Tekoah and fetched thence a wise woman, and said
unto her, I pray thee feign thyself to be a mourner,[2] and put on now [*om.* now[3]]
mourning-apparel, and anoint not thyself with oil, but [and] be as a woman that
3 had [has] a long time mourned for the dead; And come to the king, and speak
on this manner unto him. So [And] Joab put the words in her mouth.
4 And when [*om.* when] the woman of Tekoah spake [came[4]] to the king, she
[and] fell on her face to the ground and did obeisance, and said, Help O King.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. Erdmann renders: "against" and gives his reasons therefor in the Exposition. The versions generally and most commentators favor the rendering of Eng. A. V. The translation of this preposition depends on the view taken of the whole connection, on which see the notes on ch. xiii. 39.—TR.]

[2] [Ver. 2. The Hithpael in the so-called hypocritical sense, a derivation from the reflexive or reflexive-declarative sense. See Conant's Gesen., § 54. Ewald, *Gr.*, § 124 *a*.—TR.]

[3] [Ver. 2. The Eng. "now" is sometimes a proper rendering of the Heb. cohortative particle נָא (rendered just before by "I pray thee"), but would here have too much the effect of an adverb of time.—TR.]

5 And the king said unto her, What aileth thee? And she answered [said], I am
indeed [In truth, I am] a widow woman. And mine husband is dead [died][5];
6 And thy handmaid had two sons, and they two strove together in the field, and
there was none to part them, but [and] the one smote[6] the other and slew him.
7 And behold, the whole family is risen [rose] against thine handmaid, and they
[*om.* they] said, Deliver him that smote his brother, that we may [and we will]
kill him for the life of his brother whom he slew; and we [they[7]] will destroy the
heir also, and so they shall quench [and quench] my coal which is left, and shall
[will] not [*or* in order not to] leave to my husband *neither* [*om.* neither] name nor
8 remainder upon the earth. And the king said unto the woman, Go to thy house,
9 and I will give charge concerning thee. And the woman of Tekoah said unto the
king, My lord, O king, the iniquity be on me and on my father's house, and the
10 king and his throne be guiltless. And the king said, Whosoever saith *aught* unto
11 thee, bring him to me, and he shall not touch thee any more. Then said she
[And she said], I pray thee, let the king remember the Lord [Jehovah] thy God,
that thou wouldest not suffer the revengers of blood to destroy any more, lest they
destroy my son [that the avenger of blood multiply not destruction, and that they
destroy not my son[8]]. And he said, As the Lord [Jehovah] liveth, there shall not
12 one hair of thy son fall to the earth. Then [And] the woman said, Let thine
handmaid, I pray thee, speak *one* [a] word unto my lord the king. And he said,
13 Say on. And the woman said, Wherefore, then, [And why] hast thou thought
such a thing against[9] the people of God? for the king doth speak[10] this thing as
one which [that] is faulty, in that the king doth not fetch home again [bring back]
14 his banished. For[11] we must needs die, and are as water spilt on the ground, which
cannot be gathered up again; neither doth God respect *any* person [and God takes
not away the life], yet doth he devise means [and thinketh thoughts] that his

[4] [Ver. 4. The reading "came" (וַתָּבֹא, or, as in one MS. of Kennicott, וַתֵּלֶךְ) is now generally adopted, and is required by the sense. Bruns (in De Rossi) thinks that the date of the introduction of the corrupt reading (ותאמר) may be fixed in this way: The correct reading is found in all the ancient versions (not excepting the Chald., the text of which in the London Polyglot is corrupt here, and should be ואתת); but David Kimchi had the present reading (ותאמר) before him, while Cod. 154 has ותבא, whence it may be concluded that the corruption in question came between A. D. 1106 (date of Cod. 154) and 1190 (date of Kimchi's commentary). This is a very interesting fact for Old Testament text-criticism, if it be true, for it then shows that our text exhibits very recent changes. It depends on the assumption that all codices in the beginning of the twelfth century had the same reading; but it is possible that Cod. 154 and Kimchi's Cod. had different genealogies.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 5. The rendering: "I am a widow, and my husband is dead," presents a useless tautology; Böttcher therefore suggests a relative force for the ו: "inasmuch as my husband is dead;" but it may be better (with Thenius) to connect this latter clause with the following verse: "and my husband died and I had two sons," that is, when my husband died, I was left with two sons.—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 6. For וַיַּכּוּ read וַיַּךְ. The suffix is hardly allowable here; the text-form may have been originally plural, so written because the two brothers formed the subject in the mind of the writer.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 7. So Syr. and Arab. It is more probable that this is the expression of the woman than that she should put it into the mouth of the kinsfolk (against Erdmann and Wellhausen). A ה may easily have passed into a נ. Böttcher proposes to read: "we will kill, *etc.*, and destroy (נַשְׁמִיד); even (הֲגַם) the heir will they destroy," *etc.*, which puts the expression about the heir into the woman's mouth, but seems unnecessarily involved.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 11. The Inf. (הרבת) has for its subject the *Goel*, and not "the king" as in Eng. A. V. The word *goel* also is Sing., while in the succeeding clause the indef. Plu. construction is used, so that it might be rendered: "and that my son be not destroyed."—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 13. Instead of "against," Thenius renders the Prep. (עַל) by "in respect to," on the ground that David had expressed no thought contrary to the well-being of God's people. But the woman covertly refers to his procedure towards Absalom as something against the people of God.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 13. The מְדַבֵּר is better understood as a participle, either as Hithpael with assimilation of ת (as in Num. vii. 89; Ezek. ii. 2; xliii. 6) or as Piel (as Böttcher insists) with dagesh forte emphatic (as in Isa. lii. 5; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 16). Only in this way can the כְּאָשֵׁם ("as a faulty man") be easily construed, for, if the above form be taken as Infin. ("from the king's speaking this word") we should more naturally expect הוּא after כאשם; or possibly we might render (with the Sept.): "from the speaking (στόματος) of the king this thing is as a fault," where אָשָׁם is read instead of אָשֵׁם.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 14. Böttcher: "when we die, it is as (with) water," *etc.* The "needs" of Eng. A. V. represents the Infinitive Absolute (emphatic).—The difficulty in this verse lies partly in the translation of the second half, partly in the relation of thought between the two halves. The thought of our text is: "The king has declared himself faulty, in that he does not restore his banished. We die and pass away; God does not take life, but devises means not to banish his banished." Here, the expression: "to banish one already banished," is hard, but may be perhaps understood in the pregnant sense of keeping banished the banished. So the representation of God as thinking thoughts or devising means to gain an end is somewhat rudely anthropomorphic, but is not wholly out of keeping with the times and with the terse and obscure address of the wise woman. Then, the reference to human mortality (allusion to Amnon, Absalom or David?) is to quicken the king to haste or to mercy, and the exhortation is enforced by a reference to the divine mercifulness.—Various alterations have been proposed to

15 banished be not expelled [banished] from him. Now therefore [And now] that[12]
I am come to speak of this thing unto my lord the king, *it is* because the people
have made me afraid; and thy handmaid said, I will now speak unto the king;
16 it may be that the king will perform the request of his handmaid. For the king
will hear, to deliver his handmaid out of the hand of the man *that would*[13] destroy
17 me and my son together out of the inheritance of God. Then [And] thine hand-
maid said, The word of my lord the king shall now be comfortable [May the word,
etc., be for rest[14]]; for as an angel of God, so is my lord the king to discern [hear]
good and bad; therefore the Lord thy God will be [and may Jehovah thy God be]
with thee.
18 Then [And] the king answered and said unto the woman, Hide not from me, I
pray thee, the thing that I shall ask thee. And the woman said, Let my lord the
19 king now [*om.* now] speak. And the king said, Is *not* [*om.* not] the hand of Joab
with thee in all this? And the woman answered and said, As thy soul liveth, my
lord the king, none can turn to the right hand or to the left from aught that my
lord the king hath spoken; for thy servant Joab, he bade me, and he put all these
20 words in the mouth of thine handmaid; To fetch about this form of speech [To
change the face of the thing] hath thy servant Joab done this thing; and my lord
is wise, according to the wisdom of an angel of God, to know all things that are in
the earth.
21 And the king said unto Joab, Behold, now, I[15] have done this thing; go, there-
22 fore [and go], bring the young man Absalom again [back]. And Joab fell to the
ground on his face, and bowed himself, and thanked [blessed] the king; and Joab
said, To-day thy servant knoweth that I have found grace in thy sight, my lord
23 O [the] king, in that the king hath fulfilled the request of his[16] servant. So [And]
24 Joab arose and went to Geshur, and brought Absalom to Jerusalem. And the
king said, Let him turn to his own house, and let him not see my face. So [And]
Absalom returned [turned] to his own house, and saw not the king's face.
25 But [And] in all Israel there was none to be so much praised as Absalom for
his beauty; from the sole of his foot even to the crown of his head there was no
26 blemish in him. And when he polled his head (for [and] it was at every year's
end [from time to time] that he polled it, because [for] *the hair* was heavy on him,

get rid of supposed difficulties. Ewald (*Gesch. Isrl.* III. 236) changes וְחֹשֵׁב to חוֹשֵׁב and renders: "God takes not away the soul of one that thinks not to leave in banishment one banished by Himself." Here the "devising" and the "banishing" are transferred to the man; but the resultant thought (that God will not slay a merciful man) is not specially striking or appropriate. Wellhausen (reading הֵשֵׁב for חָשַׁב) translates: "We must die, *etc.*, and when God takes away a soul, does He give it back?" in which the second clause simply repeats the thought of the first. The attempts at alteration are all unsatisfactory, and the ancient versions help little or nothing. Sept.: and God will take life, even devising to thrust from Him an outcast; Theodotion: as water, *etc.*, and the soul hopes not in it; Syr.: God takes not away the soul, but deviseth means that no one may wander from Him (or, perish through Him). The Vulg. is a tolerably literal rendering of the Heb.—Houbigant (in Chandler) proposed to insert vers. 15–17 in ver. 11 after the word "son;" but there is no ground for this change nor advantage in it. There seems nothing better than to retain the present text.—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 15. The word "that" (אשר) is omitted in several MSS. and printed EDD., and in Syr., Arab., Vulg., perhaps because it seemed superfluous (Sept. ὅ).—Patrick: though the people make me afraid. Philippson: when I came, *etc.*, the people made me afraid. Better (if the אשר be retained) as Eng. A. V.—In the last clause one MS. of De Rossi has ישמע (hear) instead of יעשה (do), correction for the sake of propriety of expression. —Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 16. Something has here fallen out of the Heb. text, perhaps הַמְבַקֵּשׁ (Böttcher). Vulg. takes the word האיש as collective (*de manu omnium qui volebant*). Syriac (as not infrequently) gives a condensed rendering: "I will speak to the king; perhaps he will deliver his handmaid from the hand of men, that they destroy not me and my son," *etc.* Yet the diffuse language of the Heb. is more in keeping with the character of a glib-tongued woman assumed by the speaker.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 17. Syriac: "the word of my lord the king shall be sure, and shall be an offering (מִנְחָה)," misunderstanding the text.—Wellhausen reads at the beginning: "and the woman said" (after the Sept.), as the common formula introducing the conclusion of a long discourse. This is rendered somewhat probable by the voluntative form of the following sentence; but this form is not decisive for a change of text.—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 21. So the Kethib (text). Qeri (margin) has second person: "thou hast done," on which De Rossi says that many of his MSS. and printed EDD. have not this Qeri; and he quotes R. Jacob Chayyim and Norzi, the former of whom says that not more than one MS. in a thousand has this Qeri, and the latter that it is not found in the correctest Spanish MSS. The ancient VSS. also follow the Kethib, for which, therefore, the external authority is complete. Böttcher, however, defends the Qeri on the ground that it better suits the initial: "behold, now," and that a change from it to the Kethib is more easily explicable than the converse. But, as the text gives a good sense, these considerations (even if they were unquestionable) cannot avail against the external evidence.—Tr.]

[16] [Ver. 22. Kethib (his) in all the VSS. except Vulg.; Qeri (thy) in Vulg., and some MSS. and EDD. The text is properly retained by Erdmann and Eng. A. V.—Tr.]

therefore [and] he polled it), he weighed the hair of his head at two hundred she-
27 kels after the king's weight. And unto Absalom there were born three sons, and
one daughter, whose name was Tamar; she was a woman of a fair countenance.
28 So [And] Absalom dwelt two full [*om.* full] years in Jerusalem, and saw not the
29 king's face. Therefore [And] Absalom sent for Joab, to have sent [to send] him
to the king; but [and] he would not come to him; and when [*om.* when] he sent
30 again the second time, [*ins.* and] he would not come. Therefore [And] he said
unto his servants, See, Joab's field is near [beside] mine, and he hath barley there;
31 go and set it on fire. And Absalom's servants set the field on fire. Then [And]
Joab arose and came to Absalom unto *his* house, and said unto him, Wherefore
32 have thy servants set my field on fire? And Absalom answered [said to] Joab,
Behold, I sent unto thee, saying, Come hither, that I may send thee to the king,
to say, Wherefore am I come from Geshur? *it had been* good for me *to have been*
there still [better for me that I were still there]. Now therefore [And now] let
me see [I will see] the king's face, and if there be *any* iniquity in me, let him kill
33 me. So [And] Joab came to the king, and told him. And when he had called
for [And he called] Absalom, [*ins.* and] he came to the king, and bowed himself
on his face to the ground before the king; and the king kissed Absalom.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1–24. *Joab by a stratagem procures Absalom's return to Jerusalem without punishment.*—Ver. 1. Though David's soul was *comforted for Amnon's death*, and he had consequently desisted from the pursuit of Absalom, his anger at the latter's fratricide had nevertheless not disappeared. This supposition is psychologically necessary, since otherwise David would appear as an extremely weak man; and it is supported by the fact that he would not see Absalom for two years after his return [ver. 28]. For this reason the latter clause of this verse is to be explained as indicating not David's returning inclination to Absalom (as Vulg., Sept., Syr., Arab. [Eng. A. V.], Joseph., Cleric., and most modern expositors), but his enduring disinclination towards him. [Erdmann renders: "Joab perceived that the king's heart was against Absalom."—Tr.] It might have been supposed from the discontinuance of the pursuit that David's heart had turned to him; but Joab, who had exact knowledge of court-affairs, *observed* that the king's heart was against him. How the word "perceived" is contrary to this view (Maur., Then.) does not appear, since it contains the simple statement that David was still hostilely disposed towards Absalom. And "in the only other place where this construction (without substantive verb) occurs, Dan. xi. 28, the Prep. means *against*" (Keil). [The Prep. (עַל) is often used, however, in the general sense of "towards," sometimes with favorable meaning, and the absence of the subst. verb is not important. The whole connection (somewhat disguised by the division of chapters) seems to favor the rendering of Eng. A. V. In the last verse of the preceding chapter David's heart goes forth towards Absalom (see annotations on that verse), and here Joab is said to perceive it, so that he devises a scheme to remove the king's judicial objections to recalling Absalom. The understanding of the narrative, however, is not affected by the rendering of the Prep. In either case Joab appears as a shrewd man. Possibly he was influenced by a genuine feeling of kindness towards David and Absalom; it is more likely perhaps that he wished to ingratiate himself with them and the people (Patrick). A. P. Stanley (in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*): "Joab combines with the ruder qualities of the soldier something of a more statesmanlike character, which brings him more nearly to a level with his youthful uncle, and unquestionably gives him the second place in the whole history of David's reign." Wordsworth: "Joab is the impersonation of worldly policy, and temporal ambition practising on the weakness of princes for its self-interests." *Bib. Comm.*: "He ever appears wily and politic and unscrupulous."—Tr.]—Ver. 2. *Tekoah*, now Tekua, about five [Eng.] miles south of Bethlehem, the native place of the prophet Amos. See Robins. II. 406 [Am. ed. I. 486 sq.; and see Dr. Hackett's Art. in Am. ed. of Smith's *Bib. Dict.*—Tr.]. As Bethlehem was Joab's native place, it is not strange that he was acquainted with Tekoah. He knew this "*wise woman*" as one fitted by her readiness of speech, boldness, shrewdness, and adroitness, to act the part he wanted.* That it cost Joab so great pains to gain his end is evidence moreover against the supposition that David's heart was already turned to Absalom.–Ver. 4. "And the woman came,"† *etc.*; for so we must read instead of the first "said" [Eng. A. V.: "spake"] of the Hebrew text. Böttcher supposes that here by similar ending (homœoteleuton) two lines have fallen out, in which is given the answer of the woman before she goes to the king; but there is no sign in any ancient version of such an omission. —Ver. 5. Here begins the lively, flowing narration of the feigned misfortune. Though Joab had "put the words into the woman's mouth," yet considerable readiness was required in order to bring them out so skilfully in her assumed character, and to make such an impression on the

* [According to the Talmud (Menachoth. 85, 2) there were important oil-plantations near Tekoah, and the women there were noted for their shrewdness (Philippson).—Tr.]

† The error in the Heb. text may easily be accounted for by supposing that in the manuscript to be copied the וַתָּבֹא [came] stood immediately over the following וַתֹּאמֶר [said] (Thenius).

king as to lead him to the desired definite resolution. [Read: I am a widow. And my husband died, and I had two sons, *etc.*—Tr.]—Ver. 6. *The fratricide.* "And he smote him, the one the other," a pleonasm arising from the circumstantialness and liveliness of the narration.* [A slight change in the text will give the reading: "one smote the other," as in Eng. A. V.—Tr.]—Ver. 7. *The demand for the survivor.* "And we will destroy the heir also." Instead of this, Michaelis, Dathe and Thenius propose to read (after Syr. and Arab.): "and they will destroy," *etc.*† But these authorities [the versions] are not sufficient to warrant this emendation. Thenius urges that if the woman had put *these* words also into the mouth of the kinsmen, she would have represented them as diabolically wicked; but it does not follow that it is really so bad, simply because she *expresses her opinion* of what they *wish* to do. These words ["we will destroy the heir"] are added to the preceding "we will *kill* him" (to indicate the purpose of the kinsmen) by reason of the second thought that characterizes the blood-revenge—namely, that, while they *kill him for blood-vengeance,* they wish at the same time to destroy the surviving *heir.* The woman's purpose is not only to bring out the design of the kinsmen in their *blood-avenging* as harshly as possible, but also, with reference to David's hostile feeling to Absalom, to emphasize the point that the latter is the *heir* to David's throne, and to save him as *such* from his father's anger. [Wellhausen: "The woman does not really intend to represent the unavoidable result [killing the *heir*] as the purpose [of the kinsmen], but is carried on by the connection of the discourse; not till she has uttered the word does she correct herself." Yet the third person seems more natural here, especially as the whole thing is feigned, and the woman had carefully prepared her words beforehand.—Tr.] **So that they quench.**—The power of the discourse lies in the fact that they are represented as already doing what their words show to be their purpose. "My coal," the burning coal (ζώπυρον) with which fire is kindled. "In order not to set (permit, grant) to my husband name and remainder (posterity)."‡ [The law in the case is given in Numb. xxxv. 18, 19. Blood-revenge was no doubt an ancient pre-Mosaic custom. The whole family was against the fratricide. "This indicates that all the king's sons and the whole court were against Absalom, and that the knowledge of this was what hindered David from yielding to his affection and recalling him" (*Bib. Comm.*).—Tr.]—Ver. 8. **I will give charge concerning thee** in thy behalf. David grants her request and protects her son because, as the homicide was committed in the heat of conflict, a purposed murder was out of the question.—Ver. 9. **On me be the iniquity.**—That is, if it be wrong not to carry out the blood-avenging. The woman is not yet satisfied with the somewhat indefinite statement of the king that he would fulfil her request. She proceeds to work on him still further.—Ver. 10. She gains the end that she had in her remark in ver. 9, namely, to bring the king to *say definitely* that no one should further molest her or demand her son for blood-vengeance.—Ver. 11. Third stage of the woman's address. She wishes to bring the king to *swear* before God, and that not in the "character of a talkative woman" (Thenius), but rather to gain her end as surely as possible, and to bind the king by his own words to reconciliation with Absalom. "That the avenger of blood (cause) no more destruction" (De Wette); literally: "let the king remember the Lord thy God from the avenger's increasing* to destroy;" that is, "so that the avenger shall not more destroy"—the phrase "let him interpose" being understood (Thenius). The woman brings the king to the point of assuring her son's safety by an oath. [Patrick: "Others think she only prays him to remember how merciful and gracious God is, and had been to himself, even in pardoning the murder of Uriah"—not so well.—Tr.]

Ver. 12. *Transition* in the woman's discourse to a reference to David's relation to Absalom by the request to be permitted to say something farther. ["The woman proceeds cautiously and hence obscurely" (*Bib. Comm.*).—Tr.]—Ver. 13. "Why dost thou contrive (think, proceed) thus against the people of God?" The "thus" refers to the following words: "that the king does not bring back his banished." She goes on as if she now advanced to a second object of her coming; in reality, however, she now comes to the principal matter, though sure of success from what the king (led on by her skilful talk) had granted her. "Now she is to make the application to the king's own case, and this is hard, because she cannot speak openly and boldly like a prophet, but only slightly, and, as it were, in passing, yet must make the allusion to Absalom intelligible" (Ewald). The woman intimates that David's hostility towards Absalom is directed "*against the people of God,*" since the people would suffer in the suffering of the heir, who would some time become their king. Having thus softly represented his conduct as blameworthy from the point of view of the *people* (*among whom there was certainly a party for Absalom,* as appears from the following history), she proceeds to entrap him in his own words (spoken in reference to *her* feigned case) for Absalom's advantage. **And by the king's speaking† this word** (that is, ver. 11, the oath that her son's blood-guilt should not be avenged) **he is as one in fault** (against God's people as against Absalom), **in that the king brings**

* There is no reason for changing יְכַנּוּ to יְכַנּוּ (Ewald, § 252 *a*; Then.), since the suffix וֹ with verbs ל״ה, though infrequent, is not unexampled; nor does the Plu. suit here (Keil).—[By reading יַךְ we avoid the intolerable repetition of the Hebrew text, and the inappropriateness of the plural.—Tr.]

† יַשְׁמִידוּ [or הִשְׁמִידוּ] instead of the text-word נַשְׁמִידָה.

‡ [Bishop Patrick points out how cleverly the woman's story was put, so as essentially to include Absalom's case, while yet it was different enough from it to avoid rousing the king's suspicions at the outset.—Tr.]

* Instead of the Kethib הַרְבִּית read Qeri הַרְבַּת—an unusual form of the Infin. Absolute. Comp. Ew. § 240 *a*. [Or, הַרְבּוֹת Inf. Construct may be read.—Tr.]

† Instead of מִדַּבֵּר [Inf. with מִן], Vulg., Chald., Syr. read the Participle כְּדַבֵּר, which does not change the sense. [So Eng. A. V. See "Textual and Grammatical."—Tr.]

not back his banished.—He must show his son the mildness he has shown hers. And, as for Absalom there was only the question of punishment for a homicide, not of release from the demand of the avenger, the woman, having gained grace for her son, might the more surely expect it for Absalom. She calls Absalom *his banished* because the latter, though he had banished himself by flight, had not since received permission to return. Dathe ["why resolvest thou thus in a cause pertaining to God's people?"] and Thenius ["why thinkest thou thus in relation to God's people?" (thy *subjects*)] refer the question to David's protection of the woman and her son, while, according to his own words, he appears as blameworthy towards Absalom; but the meaning of the Heb. (עַל = against) and the connection do not permit this. [Bishop Patrick remarks that the woman's reasoning here was weak, her son's case being very different from Absalom's, but the king, inferring that the people were well disposed towards Absalom, concluded to overlook the differences, without saying any thing to her of the defects of her argument. Probably the king was glad of an excuse to recall Absalom. Though an absolute monarch, he had to attend to the wishes of the people, who liked the young prince, and would be offended if he were kept in banishment. It seems less likely that there is a reference in the words "people of God" to Absalom's deprivation of religious privileges (*Bib. Comm.*), though the phrase is intended to include Absalom.—Tr.]—Ver. 14. The reasons that should determine David to forgiveness: 1) **for we must die, and are like water poured out on the ground that is not gathered again.**—Thenius refers these words to Amnon's death, with the meaning: "he had to die some time, and all you can do against the murderer will not bring him to life;" but the connection shows that the woman is referring not to Amnon, but to Absalom, as the "banished one," her meaning being: "Absalom (like all men) may die in banishment, and, as the dead (like poured out water) do not return, it would then repent thee not to have recalled him; take him back before it is too late." Possibly, however, the reference is to David himself, a warning that he may soon die, and must, therefore, not delay to be reconciled to Absalom. [The sense seems to be: "As life is fleeting and perishable, let not these enmities engage your mind, but put away unkindness and forgive your son." According to any of these explanations, the woman's argument is false, since it leaves the justice of the case out of view; but see the quotation from Philippson below at the end of this verse.—Tr.] 2) **And God takes not away a soul, but thinks thoughts not to banish a banished one.**—An argument from God's procedure towards the sinner. He does not take away the soul [life] of one that is banished, condemned for sin, so as thus to banish him forever, but "thinks thoughts not to banish him;" such mercy show to thy banished son. These words must have brought to David's recollection God's mercy towards him banished from God's presence as adulterer and murderer. [Philippson: "This is one of the noblest and profoundest declarations of the Scripture: God, who has determined us to death, nevertheless does not deprive us of *life*, of personality (נֶפֶשׁ), but has the holy purpose to receive again the banished, the sinful." This explanation makes the first half of the verse merely introductory to the thought in the second, merely a relative sentence containing an affirmation about God; this is not so probable as the view that makes the first half a separate argument. Patrick sees here a reference to the cities of refuge, for which, however, the language is too general. The argument (appeal to the divine mercy) is powerful, though false; the human judge cannot set aside the demands of justice, though God may pardon the sinner. The woman's view of death is a general one, neither denying nor affirming a future state: her statement is simply that the dead do not return to earthly life. It is therefore inadmissible to press her simile, and represent it as meaning that, as the spilt water passes in vapor to the clouds and returns as rain to the earth, so human life is to return in the raised body. This may be an allowable simile now, but it is not the teaching of this passage.—Tr.]—Ver. 15. The wise woman skilfully turns David's thoughts again to her own affair, in order to remove the suspicion that she came merely to plead for Absalom; she is content to have lodged a sharp thorn in David's heart. **And now that I am come.**—A natural mode of return to her first subject. Her design is to append a further explanation of her boldness in troubling the king with such a personal affair. The occasion of her coming is, she says, that the people [her kinsfolk] frightened her by demanding her son, so that she had to appeal to the king. This, therefore, is not a mere repetition of what she has already said (Thenius).—Ver. 16 expresses 1) joyful *assurance* that her request will be heard, and 2) the evil from which the king will save her and her son, "destruction from the *inheritance of God*;" the cutting off* of posterity by slaying the heir is so dreadful in her eyes, because it is excision from the people belonging to the Lord. Comp. 1 Sam. xxvi. 19; Deut. xxxii. 9.—Ver. 17. Further, she says, the king's word was to be to her **for rest**—that is, for herself. "The king hears (judges) as" **the angel of God**—the angel that God sends to impart His manifestations of grace to His people, the covenant-angel, the mediator of grace for the peculiar people [the people that is God's private property]. [Rather the woman here praises the king's wisdom as being like that of one of the higher intelligences (so Achish speaks of David in 1 Sam. xxix. 9), a proof that the Israelites were then familiar with the idea of angels. Her praise is here skilfully introduced to mollify him; she does not mention Absalom's name, but leaves the king to reflect on what such a high character requires of him.—Tr.] **To hear the good and the evil.**—This affirms two things: 1) in every case brought before him the king will impartially and justly hear both sides, the good and the bad, Vulg.: "unmoved by benediction or maledic-

* There is no need to write (with Thenius) הַמְבַקֵּשׁ before לְהַשְׁמִיד (after Sept. and Vulg.), since אֲשֶׁר הָיָה ("the man *that was*, had in mind, to destroy") is naturally supplied (Gesen. § 132, 3, Rem. 1). [On this comp. "Text. and Gramm." Eng. A. V. supplies "that would."—Tr.]

tion;" 2) He helps the oppressed. **And the Lord thy God be with thee!** (not "therefore be" (De Wette)); with this blessing she concludes, touching the king's heart in its innermost relation to his God and Lord. [Patrick: "There is a great deal of artifice in all this. For to presume upon the kindness of another, and to expect gracious answers from their noble qualities, is very moving; men being very loath to defeat those who think so highly of them, according to that saying of Aristotle (*Rhet.* 2, 4, 19): 'We love those that admire us.' "—Tr.]—Vers. 18 sq. From the cleverly put discourse of the woman the king perceives that there is something else in hand than her private affair; and surmising at the same time that she is only the instrument of another, he thinks of Joab from the confidential relation in which the latter stood to Absalom. "Is the hand of Joab with thee in all this?" The woman frankly answers in the affirmative [in the form of a compliment to the king's sagacity]: **There is nothing on the right or the left of*** what the king says, he always says the right; "you always hit the nail on the head" (Thenius). Joab, she says, arranged this **to turn the face (form) of the thing** [not "fetch about this form of speech," as in Eng. A. V.—Tr.] These words do not refer to the *clothing* of the request for Absalom in this story about her sons, as if she meant: "that I should turn the thing so" (Luther), or "to disguise the thing in a skilful way" (Keil), or "to set before thee a figurative discourse" (Vatablus), or "that I should transfer to myself and my sons what pertains to the king and his sons" (Clericus), but *the thing* is Absalom's relation to his father. In order to change this relation in its present unhappy *form*, that is, to bring about a reconciliation, *has Joab done this*, sent me to thee with the words I have spoken. The woman concludes (looking back to her comparison of David to the "angel of God" in ver. 17) with the words: **My lord** (the king) **is wise according to the wisdom of the angel of God**—anxious by this appeal to the king's *wisdom* to secure a favorable decision for Absalom. [Here again render: "*an* angel of God," as in ver. 17. "To know all things that are in the earth," better, perhaps: "in the land," all the affairs of the land of Israel. The mingling of flattery and boldness in the woman's discourse is skilful and striking.—Tr.]

Vers. 21–23. *Joab's request fulfilled* by permitting Absalom to return to Jerusalem. **Behold, I have done this thing** (according to thy word).—The margin has (through misapprehension): "thou hast done;" but the text is to be retained. The Perfect is used because the thing is an accomplished fact = I have fulfilled thy request. **Go and bring Absalom back.**—These words refer merely to the execution of what had been already determined and accomplished.—Ver. 22. Joab thanks and blesses David for granting his request. To judge from his words here, he had often before made this request, but *hitherto* in vain. Read: "his servant," as in the text, against the marginal reading: "thy servant." Joab himself brings Absalom back to Jerusalem.—Ver. 24. Absalom's pardon, however, was not a full one; it consisted only in the permission to return to Jerusalem. He remained banished from the royal court. **My face shall he not see**, says David. This was no real pardon. David's anger still continued. It is a natural surmise that this was because Absalom showed no repentance and did not ask for forgiveness; there is not the slightest hint of his doing so. **Let him turn to his own house.**—These words suggest that Absalom was not merely banished from court, but also *confined to his own house*. Otherwise (as Thenius points out) he would not have been obliged to send for Joab (ver. 28 comp. with ver. 31.) [David's banishing Absalom from court was just and wise, since his crime deserved punishment, and it was right that the people should know the king's abhorrence of the crime (Patrick). Perhaps this half-forgiveness was an impolitic measure (Keil), since it may have merely vexed and embittered Absalom. It is not necessary to suppose that the king was angry with him; his conduct may have been determined by his regard for law and justice while his heart desired complete reconciliation. *Bib. Comm.* suggests that Bathsheba's influence may have been exerted to keep Absalom in disgrace for the sake of Solomon.—Tr.]

Vers. 25–33. *Absalom's person and family.*—By defiant obstinacy he secures his recall to court through Joab's mediation.—Vers. 25 sqq. *Absalom's beauty.*—He was the handsomest man in Israel. Literally: "and as Absalom there was not a handsome man in all Israel to praise much." There was no spot, no bodily blemish in him. From year to year* he polled or cut his hair. The weight of the polled hair here given, 200 shekels, is certainly too great, being about six pounds, if the royal shekel = the sacred shekel; and if it be taken as = one half the sacred shekel, the weight is still too great. There is no doubt an error of text here. Perhaps we should read 20 instead of 200 (כ may have passed into ר); "for 20 shekels (= 9 or 10 ounces) would suppose a very heavy, but not incredibly heavy, head of hair" (Thenius). [Others read four shekels—(ד instead of ר). But as all the ancient versions (except the anonymous vers. quoted in Montfaucon's Hex. as giving "one hundred") agree with the Hebrew, any such change of letters must have been made early, when probably not the present square characters, but the old Phenician were in use; so that we must go to them to discover possible changes of this sort.—There is doubt as to what particular weight is meant by the "king's shekel." It cannot be the Babylonian shekel, says Thenius, for this would point to a postexilian origin for this passage, which is impossible. The king, says Wellhausen, is the Persian Great King, and this verse betrays a postexilian origin. Nothing more definite can be said than that the king's shekel is probably a different weight from the sacred shekel, and probably less than that. Kitto mentions reading of a lady's hair that weighed more than four pounds, and, if the two hundred shekels is not more than this, it is a possible weight. It is evidently intended to represent the hair as extraordinarily heavy and strong,

* אִשׁ is later softer form for יֵשׁ, Mic. vi. 10; Ew. § 53 c.

* יָמִים וְיָמִים — יָמִים לְיָמִים ["from time to time"].—Tr.]

in order to explain xviii. 9. The ancients were accustomed to bestow much care on the hair, see Jos. Ant. 8, 7, 3, and Bp. Patrick *in loco*.—Tr.].—Ver. 27. *Absalom's children.* Only one is mentioned by name, a daughter Tamar, probably called after Absalom's unfortunate sister. The sons (contrary to custom) are not named, probably because they died young. This would explain Absalom's erecting a monument (xviii. 18) to perpetuate his name. Concerning Tamar the Sept. adds: "and she becomes the wife of Roboam the son of Solomon and bears him Abia." Now 1 Kings xv. 2 certainly describes the wife of Rehoboam and mother of Abijah as a daughter of Absalom, but calls her Maacah. The Sept. has here (as elsewhere) evidently introduced an explanation from that passage, confounding, however, Tamar with another later-born daughter of Absalom, who was Rehoboam's wife. Thenius remarks: "Rehoboam's wife is certainly a *granddaughter* of Absalom (daughter of his daughter Tamar) named after her *great-grandmother Maacah* (iii. 3);" where "perhaps" ought to stand instead of "certainly."—Ver. 28 sqq. As Absalom was not permitted for two years to enter the king's presence, and Joab declined to visit him though twice sent for (evidently because he did not wish to have any thing more to do with the matter since the king's displeasure continued), it is clear that ver. 1 cannot be rendered: "the king's heart was toward him." [David's conduct may be explained by supposing that, while his heart was with Absalom, his regard for justice led him to punish his crime by keeping him at a distance.—Tr.].—Ver. 30. Joab's "piece, parcel," that is, field (as we also use the word). Sept. has: "the portion in the field of Joab," but there is no reason to change the Heb. text accordingly.—The Heb. text reads: "I will set it on fire;" but all the versions adopt the marginal reading: "set it on fire."* The phrase "at my hand" = "alongside of my ground, beside me." This confirms the view that Absalom occupied himself with tilling the soil even in Jerusalem. That Absalom fired Joab's barley because he knew it would bring Joab to him (Keil) is not probable. It was rather an act of angry revenge in keeping with Absalom's haughty and passionate nature. In ver. 30 Sept. and Vulg. add: "and the servants of Joab came to him with garments rent, and said: Absalom's servants have set the field on fire." It is possible that these words belonged to the original text, and fell away by similar ending, two consecutive sentences ending with the word "fire" (Then.). But the narrative is perfectly clear without this addition.—Ver. 31. **Joab came to Absalom's house**, because the latter was shut up, a prisoner, as it were, in his own house.—Ver. 32. The message sent by Absalom through Joab to his father contains 1) a *reproach:* **why am I come from Geshur?** (= why didst thou send for me) if I am not permitted to appear before thee? 2) A *repudiation* of the indulgence shown him in the permission granted him to return home: **it were better for me that I were still there**; 3) a *self-willed demand:* **and now I will see the king's face**, and 4) a *defiant challenge:* **if there be iniquity in me, let him kill me.**—These words mean neither: "if the king *can* and *may* not forgive me," (Thenius), nor: "if he remember my iniquity" (Vulg.). Absalom rather defiantly challenges his father to proceed with strict justice, *if* he has done wrong; this, however, (from the tone of his speech) he does not allow, but relies on the rights he thinks he has against his father, who had been too indulgent to Amnon, having also the support of a considerable party, who would the more approve his act of bloody vengeance, because David had let Amnon go unpunished. Absalom gives no sign of repentance; there is rather a savage defiance in his words, and, instead of confessing his guilt, he challenges his father to kill him, *if* he is guilty, that is, he denies his guilt. David has already shown weakness in permitting Absalom to return without penitent confession; and by this halfway-procedure (letting him return, yet banishing him from his presence two years) had given occasion to the defiance and bitterness that appears in these words. He is now guilty of a still greater weakness in receiving Absalom into favor when he shows the very opposite of penitence.—Ver. 33. The words: **he bowed himself on his face to the ground** by no means show penitence with humble request for forgiveness, but merely exhibit the usual homage paid to the king. David was soon to taste the bitter fruits of all this faulty weakness towards Absalom.

* וְהִצִּיתוּהָ (ordinary Hiph. of יָצַת, 2 pers. plu.) instead of וְהוֹצִתִּיהָ (Hiph. according to פ״ן, 1 pers. sing.).

HISTORICAL AND ETHICAL.

1. David, weakly yielding to ungodly influence on his mind (the woman of Tekoa), on his will (Joab) and on his feeling (Absalom), sinned against the Lord in failing to punish Absalom (as he had failed to punish Amnon) for his crime, and in receiving him into favor, on his return, without penitence. As God does not forgive sin, without confession and prayer for pardon, so men must observe this law in their relations to one another. This is demanded both by truth and by justice, neither of which may be set aside by expiating and pardoning love.

2. He who in unholy, weak love confounds the disposition to forgive one's neighbor with the act of forgiveness itself, and pardons when the condition is not complied with, sins not only against God's holy ordination of love, but also against his neighbor, since the hard, impenitent heart is the more hardened by such weak love, and led into further evil, as Absalom's example shows.

3. Moral weakness makes one unforesighted and unwise, and often leads to the destruction of the moral ordinances of life, on which rests the welfare of private and public life. David, by his weakness towards Absalom, became guilty of the further dissolution of the theocratic rule of life in his house and in his kingdom; the breaking up of the royal family thereby produced was the cause and the starting-point of the breaking up of the theocratic kingdom by Absalom's revolt.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 1–3. Cramer: The children of the world are wiser in their generation than the children of light, Luke xvi. 8. Wuert. B.: The greatest

rogues have commonly the best patrons, who take interest in them and try to help them through.—[HALL: Good eyes see light through the smallest chink. The wit of Joab hath soon discerned David's renewed affection, and knows how to serve him in that which he would, and would not, accomplish.—TR.]

Vers. 4-11. STARKE: To represent something wisely is also a gift of God; for thereby much good is accomplished and much evil hindered, Prov. xviii. 15.—[HALL: We love ourselves better than others, but we see others better than ourselves: whoso would perfectly know his own case, let him view it in another's person. Parables sped well with David: one drew him to repent of his own sin, another to remit Absalom's punishment.—TR.]—SCHLIER: Foresight is profitable in all things, and doubly so when others wish to accomplish something with us. There are cases where certainly the first impression is the most correct, but as a rule it is better not to yield to the first momentary impression, but to prove everything. Had David first proved and inquired into the matter which with cunning and deceit was brought before him, he would not have given assurance with an oath.

Vers. 13 sqq. SCHLIER: If thou hast something against a person, forget not how soon thy adversary may die, how soon thou thyself also mayst perhaps have to pass away, and besides think of what God does to us, how rich is His mercy towards us.—Vers. 21 sqq. CRAMER: It is easily done, to let loose an outrageous offender and a murderer, but not so easily is it excused before God: for thereby blood-guiltiness is brought on the land, and other great misfortunes caused, Ezek. vii. 23.—J. LANGE: Wilful sinners also are not permitted, so long as they continue impenitent, to come into blessed communion with God, although instead of the well-deserved punishment they enjoy God's long-suffering.—SCHLIER: If thou wilt pardon, do it wholly, take out of thy heart everything thou hast against another person, forget also the injustice done thee, and make it thy concern again to show the other a whole and full heart.

Ver. 25. STARKE: Ungodly men often receive from God the fairest gifts, 1 Sam. ix. 2; xvii. 4.—SCHLIER: A fair body is also a gift of God, but what does all physical beauty help, if there does not also dwell therein a fair soul? A deformed and ugly man who has beauty of soul is worth more in the sight of God. The Lord looks at the heart.—Ver. 30. LANGE: Friendship that has self-interest for its ground, does not commonly last long.—Ver. 33. SCHLIER: David is propitiated, but it does not occur to him to work for a thorough reconciliation in Absalom's heart also; he brings to meet his son the old, full love; but he does not observe whether his son is in condition really to receive such love.—Chastisement without love is an outrage, no father is at liberty to plague or torture his child; but a love that cannot chastise is no love, and reaps a poor reward. A child that does not at the proper time feel the father's rod, becomes at last a rod for his father.

[Vers. 1-20. *The wise woman of Tekoah.* Her previous reputation for worldly wisdom, known to Joab. Her skilful employment, at Joab's instance, of a parallel case, yet not too obviously similar. I. Observe the *motives* to which she appeals. Knowing David's character, she makes good motives most prominent. 1) His course impolitic and unpopular (ver. 13). 2) We are all mortal, and enmities should not be perpetual. 3) God is forgiving (ver. 14). 4) She *flatters* him, *a*) as impartial (ver. 17), *b*) as knowing everything (ver. 20). II. *Contrast* this address with that of Nathan, ch. xii. In certain respects similar; but 1) One sent by Joab, the other by the Lord. 2) One designing and unscrupulous, the other sincere. 3) One mingling bad motives, the other employing only the good. 4) One flattering, the other humbling. 5) One giving the king an excuse for what he *wishes* to do, the other arousing him to what he *ought* to do. 6) One bringing upon David great temporal trouble, the other great spiritual blessing.—Ver. 14. Two great reasons for *forbearance and forgiveness.* 1) Both we and those who have wronged us *must die*, and so our enmities should not be undying. 2) *God* forbears, and is disposed to forgive.—TR.]

[Ver. 25. *Causes which spoiled the character of Absalom.* 1) The personal gift of extraordinary personal beauty. 2) Great power of bending others to his will (ver. 30; xiii. 28; xv. 6). 3) A doting father, weak through consciousness of his own great and well-known sins (ver. 1). 4) A good *excuse* for indulging revenge and selfish ambition (xiii. 22-29). 5) *Resentment* at what seemed neglect by his father and by Joab (vers. 28, 29). 6) *Success* in reckless and defiant measures (vers. 30-33). 7) *Apprehension* that the son of Bathsheba (xii. 24, 25) might supplant him as heir to the throne.—TR.]

II. *External Shattering of the Royal Authority till its Loss.*

Chapters XV.—XVIII.

1. Absalom's revolt and David's flight. Chap. XV. 1—XVI. 14.

1 And it came to pass after this that Absalom prepared him chariots [a chariot]
2 and horses, and fifty men to run before him. And Absalom rose up early, and
stood beside the way of the gate; and it was *so*, that when any man that had a
controversy came to the king for judgment [and it came to pass that, every man
that had a cause to come to the king for judgment], then [*om.* then] Absalom called
unto him, and said, Of what city art thou? And he said, Thy servant is of one of
3 the tribes of Israel [*or*, of such and such a tribe of Israel]. And Absalom said unto him, See, thy matters are good and right; but there is no man *de-*
4 *puted* of the king to hear thee. Absalom said moreover [And Absalom said]. Oh
that I were made judge in the land, that every man which [who] hath any suit or
cause [cause or controversy] might come unto me, and I would do him justice!
5 And it was *so* [And it came to pass] that when any man came nigh *to him* [*om.* to
him] to do him obeisance, he put forth his hand, and took him,[1] and kissed him.
6 And on this manner did Absalom to all Israel that came to the king for judgment;
so [and] Absalom stole the hearts of the men of Israel.
7 And it came to pass after forty [four[2]] years, that Absalom said unto the king, I
pray thee, let me go and pay my vow, which I have vowed unto the Lord [Jeho-
8 vah], in Hebron. For thy servant vowed a vow while I abode at Geshur in Sy-
ria, saying, If the Lord [Jehovah] shall bring me again indeed[3] to Jerusalem, then
9 I will serve the Lord [Jehovah]. And the king said unto him, Go in peace. So
10 [And] he arose and went to Hebron. But [And] Absalom sent spies [*or*, emissa-
ries] throughout all the tribes of Israel, saying, As soon as ye hear[4] the sound of
11 the trumpet, then ye shall say, Absalom reigneth in Hebron. And with Absalom
went two hundred men out of Jerusalem, *that were* called; and they went in their
12 simplicity, and they knew not anything. And Absalom sent for[5] Ahithophel the
Gilonite, David's counsellor, from his city, *even* from Giloh, while he offered sacri-
fices. And the conspiracy was strong; for the people increased continually with
Absalom.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 5. This is the only place in the O. T. where the verb החזיק is followed by לְ with the object taken hold of (though it is sometimes followed by עַל and by the simple noun), and here 29 MSS. and 2 printed EDD. have בְּ. Perhaps this לְ was imitated from, or by error of copyist arose from the following לְ.—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 7. Though the true reading is here unknown, the reading "four" instead of "forty" has been adopted in the revised translation because it seems at any rate much more nearly correct than the Heb. text. The reading "forty" is found in Sept. and other Greek VSS., Chald., Vulg., Cod. A. (Amiatinus); "four" in Syr., Arab, Vulg., Cod., B. C. D. E. F. K. Veronensis, Josephus.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 8. The Kethib or text is Hiph. Impf. (יְשִׁיב), the Qeri or marginal reading (ישׁוּב) is Qal Impf. (יָשׁוּב) or Qal Inf. Absolute (יָשׁוֹב). The text is maintained by Böttcher and Erdmann as a repetition of the finite verb for emphasis; but this, if possible here, is certainly less probable than the Inf. Absol. construction (favored by Sept., Syr., Chald.); write Hiph. Inf. הָשֵׁב (Thenius, Wellhausen, *Bib.-Com.*).—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 10. A few MSS. and EDD. have בְּ as prefix instead of כְּ; here impossible.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 12. The present Heb. text (וישׁלח), whether it be pointed as Qal or as Piel, cannot be so rendered, but means "and he sent," which gives no sense. Only Chald. renders the Heb. literally; the other versions insert לְ or אֶל ("to") after the verb, Vulg. *accersivit* (so Eng. A. V.). Others (as Böttcher, Thenius) insert וַיָּבֵא: "and he sent and brought Ahithophel;" Wellhausen suggests: "and he sent to Ahithophel and he came (ויבא). Some

13 And there came a messenger to David, saying, The hearts of the men of Israel
14 are after Absalom. And David said unto all his servants that were with him at
Jerusalem, Arise, and let us flee; for we shall not *else* escape from Absalom; make
speed to depart, lest he overtake us suddenly, and bring evil upon us, and smite
15 the city with the edge[6] of the sword. And the king's servants said unto the king,
Behold, thy servants *are ready to do* whatsoever my lord the king shall appoint
16 [choose]. And the king went forth, and all his household after him. And the
king left ten women *which were* [*om.* women which were] concubines to keep the
17 house. And[7] the king went forth, and all the people after him, and tarried [halted]
18 in a place that was far off [in Beth-hammarhak, *or*, at the far house]. And all his
servants passed on beside him, and all the Cherethites and all the Pelethites, and
all the Gittites, six hundred men, which [who] came after him from Gath passed
on before the king.
19 Then said the king [And the king said] to Ittai the Gittite, Wherefore goest thou
also with us? Return to thy place,[8] and abide with the king; for thou art a
20 stranger, and also an exile. Whereas thou camest *but* yesterday [Yesterday thou
camest], should I this day [and to-day shall I] make thee go up and down with us?
[*om.* ?], seeing I go whither I may [*ins.* ?] Return thou, and take back thy bre-

such change seems necessary in order to make sense of the passage.—The following phrase also: "as he was sacrificing" is obscure, as it does not appear what his sacrificing has to do with the matter. Cod. Amiatinus of the Vulg. reads: "and when he sacrificed (was sacrificing), the conspiracy became strong," thus connecting the growth of the conspiracy with the sacrifice, and so Böttcher: "when the man was come to Absalom to Hebron, as he was sacrificing, *etc.*," while Wellhausen would omit the phrase. But there is no sufficient ground for changing the text here, not even for adopting the slight change of the Vulg., which Thenius prefers, rendering: "and by his sacrificing the confederation (קֶשֶׁר) was made firm," that is, under the solemn excitement of the offering the conspirators were brought to swear fidelity to Absalom. But the meaning of the Heb. rather is that the conspiracy grew strong by accession of numbers. If we retain the text, we shall have to understand that Ahithophel was brought away as he was discharging a solemn duty, that is, summoned in haste to join the conspiracy, where success depended on rapid movement, or that he was summoned to join Absalom as the latter was sacrificing (so Chandler, *Bib.-Com.*). Patrick says: "after he had sacrificed," but the words do not permit this.—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 14. לְפִי — "to (according to) the mouth," or at "the mouth."—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 17. The Sept. here varies somewhat from the Heb., and various changes of the latter have been suggested. The Sept. translation, however, in its present form contains a duplet; two different renderings of 17 *b* and 18 are combined, and these two in general confirm the Heb. text. The first Sept. rendering (vers. 17, 18) is: "and the king went forth and all his servants" (Heb. "all the people," but some MSS. agree with the Greek, and Chald. has "all his household") on foot (properly "at his feet, after him"), and stood in the far house. And all his servants passed by at his hand and all the Cherethites and all the Pelethites and all the Gittites the six hundred men that came after him from Gath and going before the face of the king," which varies from the Heb. in one word only, putting "servants" (*i. e.*, body-guard) instead of "people." The second Sept. rendering (beginning with 17 *b* and inserted in the above after the word "Pelethites") is: "and stood at the olive-tree in the wilderness" (בְּזֵית הַמִּדְבָּר instead of בֵּית הַמֶּרְחָק "far house"), and all the people (Heb. "servants") went by at his side (hand) and all those about him (this is possibly a general rendering of "Cherethites and Pelethites," who formed a body-guard) and all the stout men and all the warriors (perhaps a double rendering of גִּבּוֹרִים "heroes," which they read instead of גִּתִּים "Gittites") six hundred men, and were at his hand," after which the phrase "Cherethites and Pelethites" is repeated by error of copyist. From a comparison of the Heb. and Greek texts Böttcher proposes to read "at the olive-tree in the wilderness" (ver. 17) instead of "at the far house;" to which Thenius replies that this is impossible, since David had not then passed over the Kidron. Thenius himself would adopt the "mighty men" (גִּבּוֹרִים) suggested by the Sept. instead of the "Gittites" of the Hebrew; this emendation is a very natural one, but the fact of David's having a band of foreign warriors is not so strange and improbable as to call for correction; the other versions here support the Heb. In ver. 17 Wellhausen prefers the "servants" of the Sept. to the "people" of the Heb., as indicating that David's body-guard stood with him while the army passed on; and this reading, which is supported by some MSS. and EDD., and by the Chald. (see above) is probable; so in ver. 18 Sept. has "people" instead of "servants." Wellhausen thinks also that some phrase introducing Ittai is necessary at the end of ver. 18, and that there are traces in the Heb. text of some such original passage: as, the statement that the six hundred men came "after him" from Gath, which was not true of this march. Ver. 18 might then read: "and all the people passed on by him, and all the Cherethites and all the Pelethites and all the heroes (Gibborim), six hundred men, and Ittai also the Gittite, who not long before had come from Gath to Jerusalem, passed on before the king." While this would ease the text and explain the circumstances, it seems too violent a change to make without more external support, especially as abrupt introduction of personages well-known at the time is not contrary to the usage of our narrative.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 19. Eng. A. V. here gives the only possible translation (which is also that of Pagninus) of the Heb. text in its present form. Pagninus: "Return (and abide with the king, for thou art a stranger and an exile) to thy place." *Bib.-Com.*: "Return and abide with the king (for thou art, *etc.*) at thy place." But this parenthesis is very hard, and it would seem better either to remove the "to thy place" and put it after "return" (in the Heb.), a change that is without external support, or to read "from" (מִן) instead of "to" (לְ), and render: "and an exile art thou from thy place" (so one MS., several printed EDD., and Sept., Syr., Arab., Vulg.). Cahen follows the Chald.: "for thou art a stranger, and also if thou wilt migrate, go to thy place," which differs from Eng. A. V. only in inserting the word "go" instead of transposing the phrase "to thy place." Philippson: "thou art an exile for thy place," which gives no good sense.—Böttcher and Thenius object to the supposed satirical tone of the remark: "abide with the king;" the former would read "in the city (בְּעִיר) of the king," which is an improbable phrase, the latter simply "in the city." The Syr. and Arab. also seem to have felt a difficulty here; Syr.: "desist from the king," Arab.: "go not forth with the king." The Heb. text is preferable.—Tr.]

21 thren; mercy and truth be with thee. And Ittai answered the king and said, As
the Lord [Jehovah] liveth, and as my lord the king liveth, surely in what place
my lord the king shall be, whether in [for] death or [*ins.* for] life, even there also
22 will [there will] thy servant be. And David said to Ittai, Go, and pass over.[9] And
Ittai the Gittite passed over, and all his men, and all the little ones that were with
him.
23 And all the country [land] wept with a loud voice,[10] and all the people passed
over; the king also himself [and the king] passed over the brook Kedron, and all the
24 people passed over, toward the way of the wilderness. And lo Zadok also and all the
Levites *were* [*om.* were] with him, bearing the ark of the covenant of God;[11] and they
set down the ark of God; and Abiathar went up, until all the people had done pass-
25 ing out of the city. And the king said unto Zadok, Carry back the ark of God into
[to] the city. If I shall find favour in the eyes of the Lord [Jehovah], he will
26 bring me again, and show me *both* it and his habitation. But [And] if he thus say,
I have no delight in thee; behold, *here am* I, let him do to me as seemeth good unto
27 him. The king said also [And the king said] unto Zadok the priest, Art *not* [*om.*
not] thou a seer?[12] return into [to] the city in peace, and your two sons with you,
28 Ahimaaz thy son, and Jonathan the son of Abiathar. See, I will tarry in the
plain [by the fords[13]] of the wilderness, until there come word from you to certify
29 me. Zadok therefore [And Zadok] and Abiathar carried the ark of God again to
Jerusalem; and they tarried[14] there.
30 And David went up by the ascent of *mount* Olivet, and wept as he went up, and
had his head covered, and he went barefoot; and all the people that was with him
covered every man his head, and they went up, weeping as they went up.
31 And one told David, saying, Ahithophel is among the conspirators with Absa-
lom. And David said, O Lord [*om.* O Lord], I pray thee, turn [Turn, I pray thee]
32 the counsel of Ahithophel into foolishness [*ins.* O Jehovah]. And it came to pass
that, when David was come to the top *of the mount*, where he worshipped God
[where God was worshipped[15]], behold Hushai the Archite [Arkite] came to meet

[9] [Ver. 22. Sept.: "Come and pass over with me. And Ittai the Gittite passed over, and the king and all his men, *etc.*," which Thenius adopts, but Böttcher and Wellhausen remark that it entirely misrepresents the scene, where the troops are passing in review before the king, and it is impossible to suppose that his "little ones" were with him; the king himself does not pass over the brook till ver. 23.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 23 Instead of קוֹל "voice" some Heb. MSS., Syr., Arab., have בְּכִי "weeping," an unnecessary change. Some MSS. and EDD. omit the difficult אֵת at the end of the verse, but Böttcher changes it to זֵית "olive" in accordance with his untenable correction in ver. 17 (and so Thenius and some anonymous Greek versions).—Wellhausen omits the first כָּל־הָעָם, changes עֹבֵר into עֹמֵד and לִפְנֵי into לְפָנָיו, and renders: "and all the land wept with a loud voice and passed over; and the king stood in the brook Kidron, and all the people passed over in his presence the way of the wilderness." The first correction is unnecessary, since the Heb. text (omitting אֵת) gives a good sense; the second correction, which represents the king as standing in the brook while the people passed, is not probable; the third gets rid of the superfluous repetition of the statement that the people passed over, but has the disadvantage of representing the bystanders ("all the land") as passing over, which there is no reason to suppose they did.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 24. The Sept. insertion here, ἀπὸ Βαιθάρ, a corruption apparently of Ἀβιάθαρ, has suggested various changes of the text. Probably our text is here defective, and Abiathar was perhaps more prominent in the original; but there is no ground for Wellhausen's remark that we have here a post-exilian attempt to eliminate Abiathar from the narrative in the interests of the Zadokites.—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 27. The present Heb., with the masoretic pointing can only be rendered: "art thou a seer?" Erdmann, changing the pointing (הֲ into הָ): "Thou seer!" To this Thenius objects that "prophet" and "seer" are two different things, and that there is no propriety in here calling Zadok by the latter name; he himself writes: הִפָּנֵה "turn back," which, however, does not account for the text-reading. The simplest emendation is that of Wellhausen, who writes: הַכֹּהֵן הָרֹאשׁ "to Zadok the high-priest." To this the objection is that the phrase occurs only in late books, Kings, Jer., Ezra, Chron., and this is not satisfactorily removed by Wellhausen's remark that "the expression comes from the redactor," since this would be the only instance in which a late (postexilian?) redactor has used the expression. The reading רְאֵה or רְאוּ would be supported by the same word at the beginning of ver. 28, as well as by Sept. The Syr. omits the word.—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 28. So (with Kethib) Erdmann, Böttcher, Thenius, Wellhausen, Keil. Cahen and Wordsworth: "passages of the wilderness" (leading to the river).—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 29. Sept.: "It abode there," preferred by Wellh., but unsupported by other versions, and not decidedly better than the Heb.—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 32. Or, "where it was the custom to worship God," an indication that public worship of God was maintained also elsewhere than at the Tabernacle.—Hushai is here called simply "the Arkite," but in the Septuagint "the Arkite, the friend of David" (ἀρχιεταῖρος = Αρχὶ ἑταῖρος), see ver. 37. This is probably an addition of the Sept., as Böttcher remarks.—The word rendered "coat" in Eng. A. V. is the *Kuttoneth* or tunic (χιτών), but we do not know its exact shape and size; it seems to have been shorter than the *meil*, which was the outer garment or robe.—Tr.]

33 him with his coat [garment] rent, and earth upon his head. Unto whom David
said [And David said to him], If thou passest on with me, then shalt thou be a
34 burden unto me; But[16] if thou return to the city, and say unto Absalom, I will be
thy servant, O king; *as* [*om.* as] I have been thy father's servant hitherto, so will
I now also [and now I will] be thy servant; then mayest thou for me defeat the
35 counsel of Ahithophel. And *hast thou* not there with thee Zadok and Abiathar the
priests? therefore [and] it shall be *that* [*om.* it shall be that] what thing soever
thou shalt hear out of the king's house, thou shalt tell *it* [*om.* it] to Zadok and
36 Abiathar the priests. Behold, *they have* there with them their two sons, Ahimaaz
Zadok's *son*, and Jonathan Abiathar's *son;* and by them ye shall send unto me
37 everything that ye can [*om.* can] hear. So [And] Hushai David's friend came
into [to] the city, and Absalom came[17] into [to] Jerusalem.

CHAP. XVI. 1. And when [*om.* when] David was a little past the top *of the hill*,
[*ins.* and] behold, Ziba the servant of Mephibosheth met him, with a couple of
asses saddled, and upon them two hundred *loaves* of bread, and an hundred bunches
[cakes] of raisins, and an hundred of summer-fruits [cakes of figs], and a bottle
2 [skin] of wine. And the king said unto Ziba, What meanest thou by these? And
Ziba said, The asses *be* [are] for the king's household to ride on, and the bread and
summer-fruit [figs] for the young men to eat, and the wine that [for] such as be
[are] faint in the wilderness may [to] drink. And the king said, And where is
3 thy master's son? And Ziba said unto the king, Behold, he abideth at Jerusalem;
for he said, To-day shall the house of Israel restore me the kingdom of my father.
4 Then said the king [And the king said] to Ziba, Behold, thine are all that per-
tained unto [is all that belonged to] Mephibosheth. And Ziba said, I humbly be-
seech thee [I bow down] *that* [*om.* that]; I may [may I] find grace in thy sight,
my lord O king.
5 And when [*om.* when] king David came to Bahurim, [*ins.* and] behold, thence
came out a man of the family of the house of Saul, whose [and his] name was Shi-
6 mei, the son of Gera; he came forth, and cursed still as he came. And he cast
stones at David, and at all the servants of king David; and all the people and all
7 the mighty men were on his right hand and on his left. And thus said Shimei
when he cursed, Come out, come out, thou bloody man, and thou man of Belial
8 [wicked man]. The Lord [Jehovah] hath returned upon thee all the blood of the
house of Saul, in whose stead thou hast reigned, and the Lord [Jehovah] hath de-
livered the kingdom into the hand of Absalom thy son; and behold, thou *art taken*
9 in thy mischief [thou art in thy calamity[18]], because thou art a bloody man. Then
said Abishai the son of Zeruiah [And Abishai, *etc.*, said] unto the king, Why should
this dead dog curse my lord the king? let me go over, I pray thee, and take off
10 his head. And the king said, What have I to do with you, ye sons of Zeruiah? so[19]

[16] [Ver. 34. The present form of the Sept. reads: "and if thou return to the city and say to Absalom, Thy brethren are passed over, and the king behind me has passed over, thy father; and now I am thy servant, O king, suffer me to live; thy father's servant was I then and lately, and now I am thy servant; and thou shalt disconcert for me the counsel of Ahithophel." Ewald would adopt the words "thy brethren, *etc.*," as a statement that David and his other sons had gone on while Hushai went to Jerusalem. But Thenius and Wellhausen properly remark that the Sept. text here contains a duplet; the sentence "thy brethren, *etc.*," is simply a misreading of the Heb. words "thy servant am I, *etc.*" The phrase "suffer me to live" (which Wellh. calls "too spaniel-like") is the rendering of אחיה (instead of the text אהיה); and Böttcher remarks that the "and lately" (καὶ ἀρτίως) is an addition of the Sept. without support in the Heb.—The frequency of the ו ("and") in this verse is remarkable, and is imitated only by the Chald.. "I indeed was thy father's servant, and now I indeed am thy servant," a form of address intended to convey the eagerness of the speaker.—TR.]

[17] [Ver. 37. The Impf. יָבוֹא. Ewald (Gr. § 346 *b*): "the Impf. in simple narrations, where we should perhaps expect the Perf., indicates something synchronous or continuous." Here, "when Absalom was on the point of entering Jerusalem."—TR.]

[18] [Chap. XVI. Ver. 8. Margin of Eng. A. V.: "behold thee in thy evil." Vulg,: "thy evils press thee." Anonymous Greek: "and he showed me thy evil" (misreading, הִגִּיד for הִנְּךָ). The context shows that רעה is here "calamity" rather than "mischief."—TR.]

[19] [Ver. 10. Eng. A. V. here follows the Qeri. Erdmann, Maurer, Wellhausen, Thenius, Philippson and others retain the Kethib and render the כִּי variously; Maurer: "when;" De Rossi: "for;" Philippson: "yea;"

let him curse, because [for] the Lord [Jehovah] hath said unto him, Curse David;
[,] who shall then say [and who shall say], Wherefore hast thou done [doest thou]
11 so? And David said to Abishai and to all his servants, Behold, my son, which
[who] came forth of my bowels, seeketh my life, [*ins.* and] how much more now
may this Benjamite *do it* [how much more now the Benjaminite]? let him alone, and
12 let him curse; for the Lord [Jehovah] hath bidden him. It may be that the Lord
[Jehovah] will look on mine affliction, and that the Lord [Jehovah] will requite
13 me good for his cursing this day. And as [*om.* as] David and his men went by
[on] the way, [*ins.* and] Shimei went along on the hill's side over against him,
14 and cursed as he went, and threw stones at him, and cast dust. And the king and
all the people that were with him came weary [*or*, came to Ajephim] and refreshed
themselves there.

Cahen: "if." The apodosis may be begun with וְכִי יהוה אָמַר or with וּמִי; in the first case render: "when he curses, Jahveh has bidden him, *etc.*;" in the second case: "when he curses, and when Jahveh has bidden him, who will say?" Sept. and Vulg. (from ver. 11): "let him alone."—Böttcher renders: "if (כִּי), he curses the mouth of Jahveh (פִּי יהוה, that is, Jahveh Himself) has ordered it." This reading was suggested to him, he says, by the fact, that, reading in the twilight, he mistook the כִּי for פִּי; but it has little in its favor.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1–12. *Absalom's insurrection.*—Ver. 1. "*After this.*" The word here used (מֵאַחֲרֵי כֵן comp. iii. 28) shows that what is here related *follows immediately** on the event narrated in xiv. 28–33. Absalom provides himself a *state-chariot* with its appurtenances [fifty runners or footmen] in order thus to assume a royal *appearance* and to attract the wondering *attention* of the people to himself. Comp. the similar procedure of Adonijah, 1 Kings i. 5.—Ver. 2 sq. Vivid description of his condescending behaviour (in contrast with his pompous appearance) to gain the *favor* of the people in connection with their *law-matters*. [He "rose up early" in order to show his zeal and get opportunities; and such legal business is usually attended to very early in the East; Malcolm (quoted by Philippson) says that Oriental ministers hold their levees at an hour when Western people of quality are not yet up.—Tr.]. The "gate" here referred to is the gate of the royal palace, whither those came that sought the decision of the king in law-matters. "For judgment," that is, for legal decision. The "hearer" is the judicial officer whose duty it was first to hear and understand the people's matters, and then lay them before the king, an auscultator. For just decision everything depends on careful hearing and understanding. **But there is no hearer for thee on the part of the king.**—Absalom guards indeed against accusing the king himself of injustice; but he excites in the minds of the people distrust of the king's whole judicial practice by saying that there was no regular judicial process for a good and just cause. Perhaps neglect and partiality had crept in, so that Absalom could find some handle for his charges, and avail himself of an already existing dissatisfaction. In the words: **See, thy matters are good and right**, he gives (in order to win favor) a judicial decision before thorough investigation has been made. Thy just cause, says he, is not investigated; else thou would'st not lack a favorable decision. [Absalom shows himself master of the art of political intriguing—he flatters the people and brings charges against the rulers. Perhaps his insinuations were directed in part against the princes his brothers, possibly against Solomon (Patrick), whose age, however, at this time we do not know, or whether it had been intimated that he was heir to the throne.—Tr.].—Ver. 4. "O that I were made judge," literally: "who will make me judge?" (Ges. § 136, 1). "That to me [lit. "on me"], might come every man." The "to me" is put first for the sake of emphasis; Absalom contrasts himself as just judge with the state of things under his father. עָלַי ("on me") stands for אֵלַי ("to me"), or, the sentence is to be explained with Thenius from the collective idea "all men" (כָּל־אִישׁ): "In imagination Absalom sees the litigants assembled *around him*;" comp. Ex. xviii. 13; Judg. iii. 19; 1 Sam. xxii. 6. The phrase "on me" is not to be explained from the sitting of the judge and the people standing around above him. [The phrase "come on me" is like English "press on," "lean on," and implies probably that Absalom would bear their burdens, or else, the proposition here = "at, near, with" (apud).—Tr.].—**I would do him justice.**—Absalom here presumes on the people's litigiousness and their confidence in the justice each man of his own cause, and, having brought his father's judicial procedure into discredit with them, promises to do every man justice. Vulg.: "I should judge justly."—Ver. 5 sq. [*Absalom's affability*]. He magnanimously puts aside the honor gained by these arts, and attaches the people to him by a pretended fraternization with every man. The result of these preparations for the purposed insurrection: **Absalom stole the hearts of the men of Israel.**—The phrase (גָּנַב לֵב) may also mean "to *deceive* the heart," as in Gen. xxxi. 20;

* [This remark is made also by Thenius and Keil, but it is doubtful whether the idea of immediateness is contained in the adverb itself, that is, especially in the prefix מִן. This prefix (= "from") cannot in itself convey the idea, and the meaning of the adverb must be determined by usage; but it occurs too seldom in the O. T. (only three times 2 Sam. iii. 28; xv. 1; 2 Chron. xxxii. 23) to permit us to draw the conclusion stated by Thenius.—Tr.]

but the connection shows that the meaning here is "to *steal* the heart." [Sept. very well: "made his own the heart," ἰδιοποιεῖτο; Vulg.: *solicitabat corda*.—Tr.]. He turned the hearts of the people by guile from his father to himself. [Patrick: a most vile piece of flattery (ver. 5), yet acceptable to the people. So Plato (Rep. Lib. viii.), describes those as doing that would get possession of the government; and see Aristotle Pol. V. 4. Absalom's beautiful person no doubt attracted the people, as well as his condescending familiarity of manner.—Tr.]

Vers. 7–12. *The conspiracy set on foot.*—Ver. 7. The statement of time: **At the end of forty years**, is certainly wrong according to the connection. An immediate sequence of events being indicated in ver. 1 [see on ver. 1 and translator's note], the phrase "at the end of" can only point to a previous occurrence in Absalom's life—not, however, to his return from Geshur, which is not important enough in the narrative to serve as reckoning-point (*terminus a quo*) for a new series of events, but rather to his reconciliation with David (xiv. 33). But Absalom's procedure here described (vers. 1–6) up to his insurrection cannot have lasted forty years; and further, such a space of time cannot be fitted into the history of David and Absalom, though this would be allowable only in case there were here indicated some chronological-historical point of support, as it has been attempted to find, for example, in Absalom's age at this time or in the duration of David's reign. According to these conjectures Absalom's conspiracy must have occurred in the last days of David's reign, and this would be wholly unhistorical. The reading of Codd. 70 and 90 (Kennicott) "forty *days*" is a violent attempt to remove the difficulty, and only introduces another difficulty, since forty days is too short a time after Absalom's reconciliation with his father for all his preparations here described. We must read "*four years*" with Syr., Arab., Vulg. [but Codex Amiatinus has "forty"—Tr.], Josephus, Theodoret (Capellus, Grotius, Ewald, Thenius, Keil and others [*Bib.-Com.*]).* [Others, (as Ussher, Patrick, Cahen, Philippson) retain the number "forty," and reckon it in various ways. some from the beginning of David's reign (Abarbanel), some from David's anointment by Samuel (Ussher and others), some from the people's demand for a king (Seder Olam); but the objection to all these is (as Erdmann above suggests) that there is no hint in the text of so remote a *terminus a quo* as any of them; the time is evidently reckoned from some near event. Though the number *four* is more probable than *forty*, it is after all only a conjecture, though a well-supported one; the chronology must here be regarded as uncertain.—Tr.]. —Ver. 8. Absalom's "vow" and "serving the Lord" is to be understood of the offering of a sacrifice. He wished to sacrifice *in Hebron*, ostensibly, no doubt, because it was his birth-place, but really because (his father having there assumed the crown) he considered it a peculiarly suitable place for his being proclaimed king. He chose this place, not because there was dissatisfaction at the removal of the royal residence to Jerusalem (Thenius and Keil, following the "Exegetical Manual"), but because he could there count on a numerous following from the tribe of Judah.* [We have here an example of sacrificial feasting not in connection with the Tabernacle (as in David's history 1 Sam. xx. 6), an indication that the strict law of Leviticus (Lev. xvii. 3, 4; comp. Deut. xii. 13, 14) was not in practical operation; else David would have objected to sacrificing in Hebron.—Tr.].—Ver. 9. David permits himself to be deceived by the pretence of a *thank-offering* in *Hebron*, which Absalom might have offered as well, or better, in Jerusalem. Ewald remarks: "that David observed nothing of all this till the startling news reached him that the heart of Israel was turned to Absalom, cannot be reckoned to his disadvantage, since so ancient and simple a kingdom had nothing like our modern state-police; it is rather a mark of the noble-minded security that we elsewhere see in him, that he gives so free scope to his beloved son, who might be regarded as first-born and heir-apparent, and whose quiet nature certainly even greatly pleased him."—Ver. 10. "*Absalom sent.*" The verb is not Pluperfect but Imperfect, since the sending out of emissaries might be synchronous with the journey to Hebron, where Absalom's accomplices had gotten everything in readiness for proclaiming him king, else he could not have said: As soon as ye hear the sound of the trumpet,† say, Absalom is become king in Hebron. **Absalom sent emissaries into all the tribes of Israel**, to find out public opinion and prepare for his attempt throughout the whole kingdom *at the same time*, he having already gotten the favor of the people by the arts above-related, and thrown his net over them. The emissaries had only to spread the net wider and deeper, and then at the signal to draw it in and catch the people.—Ver. 11. The *two hundred men that accompanied him* were not "poor, dependent people," which would certainly have excited surprise, but courtiers such as ususually accompanied kings and kings' sons on their journeys without causing remark. That these men might be perfectly at their ease, under the impression that they were going to a sacrificial feast at Hebron, and that the real purpose might the better be concealed from David, nothing was said to them of Absalom's design; they knew "nothing at all" of the matter. Taken by surprise in Hebron by the sudden proclamation of Absalom as king, they must have appeared to the people at Jerusalem and elsewhere as part of the royal retinue. [*Bib.-Com.* points out the extreme secrecy of the affair as explaining David's ignorance of it, and also Absalom's taste for large entertainments.—Tr.]. Ver. 12. *Ahithophel* appears as Absalom's secret

* According to Ewald and Böttcher our text arose from the fact that אַרְבָּעִים שָׁנָה [*arbaim shanah*, forty years] occurs much more frequently than אַרְבַּע שָׁנִים [*arba shanim*, four years], and the terminations *a* and *im* were confounded by the careless hearing of the scribe. The numbers from 2 to 10 usually take the plural after them; but there are exceptions, as 2 Ki. xxii. 1. Comp. Ges. § 120.2.

* יָשִׁיב is not Infin., but Impf. Hiph., used for emphasis instead of the Infin.; "if he *really* bring me back." Comp. Böttcher. [On this see "Text. and Gram.—Tr.]

† [Cahen: "As it was impossible to hear one trumpet all over the land, we must suppose that there were various stations where the signal was repeated."—Tr.]

counsellor in the contriving of the conspiracy, and so as traitor to David, whose counsellor he was. His native city *Giloh* was near and south of Hebron (Josh. xv. 51, 54). The text reads literally: "He sent Ahithophel from his city," that is, he caused him to come. Either this expression is to be regarded as a pregnant one="he sent and brought" (Keil), or we must change the vowel-points.* Why Ahithophel abandoned David is not said; probably from dissatisfaction and ambition. [Patrick: "And it is supposed by the Jews that Ahithophel was incensed against David for abusing Bathsheba, whom they take to have been his grand-daughter, she being the daughter of Eliam (xi. 3), and Eliam being the son of Ahithophel (xxiii. 34)."—So Blunt, *Coincidences*, Part II. (ix.) —Tr.]—No doubt he had been slyly working at Giloh, and had prepared everything for proclaiming Absalom. The conspiracy grew rapidly, and the people came to Absalom in constantly increasing numbers. It is noticeable that it is in the tribe of Judah that this defection from David is consummated. The elements of this so astonishingly successful insurrection of Absalom were David's grievous sins, his weakness towards Amnon and Joab, the lacks of the royal government and the consequent dissatisfaction among the people. [The expression: "while he offered bloody offerings" is difficult. If the subject be Ahithophel, it does not appear why his offering should be mentioned; or if, as is more probable, the subject is Absalom, the reason for his sending for Ahithophel *while* he was offering is not clear; we should rather have expected the latter to be present at the beginning of the solemn sacrifice that was to pledge the conspirators. As the text stands, it cannot be rendered: "he sent for Ahithophel to be present when he offered," nor: "and while he sacrificed, the conspiracy grew strong," though something like one of these renderings seems to be the meaning. The text is discussed in "Text. and Gram."—Grotius refers to the similar procedure of Civilis (pledging conspirators at a feast), Tacit., *Hist.* IV. 14.—Tr.]

Ch. xv. 13—xvi. 14. *David's flight before Absalom.*†—Ver. 13. Literally: "the messenger;" according to our usage: "*a* messenger," the Heb. employing the Def. Art. to express the *class* individualized in the person in question. Comp. Ges. § 109, 3, Rem. 1 *b*, *c*.—"The heart of the men of Israel is after Absalom"—"to be after one" means "to attach one's self to him, embrace his cause." Comp. ii. 10; 1 Sam. xii. 14.—Ver. 14. **Up! let us flee.** David's immediate flight is to be explained (according to the *reason* that he himself here gives) by the fact that seized not with momentary *fear* (Thenius), but doubtless with sudden *terror* at the unexpected revolution, he yet sees that the fulfilment of Nathan's prophecy of approaching "misfortune" (xii. 10, 11) is now beginning, that the punishment cannot be warded off, and that to stay in Jerusalem will only occasion a storming of the city with much bloodshed, which he wishes to avoid. "Against an insurrection so vigorous, and yet so thoroughly groundless and unintelligible, the best defence was to withdraw quietly and try to gain time; the first fright happily gotten over, sober thought would soon return in many places" (Ewald). [How far Jerusalem was now in condition to stand a siege (Zion was probably fortified), or whether David had a well-organized standing army, and how much of the army Absalom carried off, we do not know; David's forces seem not to have received any important addition after he left the city. Two reasons for leaving Jerusalem would be: to spare the city the horrors of a siege, and to gain the advantage of his military skill and of the discipline of his tried warriors in the open country.—Tr.]—[Ver. 15. David's servants (soldiers) declare themselves ready to obey his commands—a comfortable faithfulness in the midst of general defection.—Tr.]—Ver. 16. The king's household went "after him" (בְּרַגְלָיו), comp. Judg. iv. 10, 15, not: "on foot" (Michaelis). **The king left ten concubines to keep the house.** It appears from xix. 6 [Eng. A. V. 5] that other concubines went along with him.—Ver. 17. "All the people," all persons attached to the court, including the numerous body of servants = "the whole household" (ver. 16). They halted at "the farthest (or far) house" [Eng. A. V.: "a place that was far off"] on the road to Mount Olivet, but this side the Kidron. So the German phrase "the last cent" (*der letzte Heller*) used as a proper name to designate a farm lying at the extremity of a region. Probably this designation had already become a proper name among the people. [*Bib. Com.*: "very likely a fort guarding the passage of the Kidron." Others write: Beth-merhak.—Tr.]—Ver. 18. David having *halted* here with his immediate retinue (of his household), caused first all his servants to *pass by at his side* (עַל־יָדוֹ), then his body guard and six hundred Gittites (who had followed him from Gath) to pass *before him*, so that the latter formed the vanguard. On the "Cherethites and Pelethites" comp. viii. 18. As the "*six hundred men* that followed him *from Gath*" are called "*all the Gittites*," they must be those six hundred faithful companions-in-arms that gathered about David during Saul's persecution (1 Sam. xxii. 2; xxiii. 13; xxv. 13), went with him to Gath (1 Sam. xxvii. 2 sq.) and settled with him in Ziklag (1 Sam. xxvii. 8; xxix. 2; xxx. 1, 9). Thence they marched with him to Hebron (ii. 3) and Jerusalem (v. 6). They are the same that are called "Gibborim" [heroes, mighty men] in xvi. 6, and appear as his military escort. Comp. xx. 7; xxiii. 8 sqq., where the *Gibborim* seem to be identical with these. "They very probably formed, from the time that David went to reside at Jerusalem, a special body, known as 'the Gibborim,' kept always in full number (hence here also, six hundred), living in barracks at Jerusalem (see Appendix to the Books of Kings, § 7), employed only in the most important undertakings (x. 7; xx. 7, 9) the Old Guard, as it were, who here also will protect the retreat of their lord with their stout, faithful bodies" (Thenius). They are here called "the Gittites" because they were so called by the people, as having followed David "*from Gath on*" (Keil). There is no necessity for read-

* So as to read וַיְשַׁלַּח [Piel] for וַיִּשְׁלַח [Qal]. [But this does not help. See "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

† [Ewald remarks that a completer history is given of this day than of any other day in the Bible-narrative—a day crowded with events.—Tr.]

ing *Gibborim* instead of *Gittites* (Thenius), especially as all the versions have the latter. [This reading is discussed in "Text. and Gram." Some hold these "Gittites" to be foreigners (Philistines) that had entered David's service, as we know many foreigners did; and this is probable, if we retain the present text. But that the Gibborim were called "Gittites" (Keil) is not probable, and as there is no account of such a body of Philistines having *followed* David from Gath (that is, when he lived there), there is strong reason for reading *Gibborim* instead of *Gittites*.—Tr.]—Ver. 19. *Ittai* was a Philistine of Gath, "who had lately with other bold Philistine warriors come over to David, and, having probably had a good position in his native city, was also assigned a high place by David" (Ewald). According to ver. 22 his wife and children were with him. He was given command of one-third of the army (xviii. 2), and stood along with Joab and Abishai as an able general. It need not surprise us that a foreigner should occupy such a military position; comp. xi. 3, Uriah the Hittite. David advises this faithful follower not to go with him, but to remain "with the king" at Jerusalem. This phrase cannot mean: with him that is or will be king, according to God's will, whether it be David or Absalom (Keil, and so Seb. Schmidt: "it is not your business to decide this contest: wait quietly, see whom God chooses and serve him"), but it must be referred definitely to *Absalom*, who in David's eyes is now king *de facto*. Ewald: David gave him the friendly advice to stay in Jerusalem *with the new king*. David thus neither recognizes Absalom as *rightful* king (Böttch.), nor *ironically* so calls him = "with him who is acting as if he were king" (Clericus). In this usurpation of the throne David recognizes and submits to a divine dispensation, and so calls Absalom king.—The *reason* for his counsel to Ittai: "**For thou art a stranger and moreover an emigrant** (exile) **in thy place.** "Stranger" = not an Israelite; "emigrant or exile" (גֹּלֶה) = one not in his native land. The last phrase may be rendered: "for* thy place," or "in respect to thy place," or may be taken to express a state of quiet (comp. Ges. § 154, 3 *c*). The meaning is: "as a foreigner, thou needst not care who is king, or join either side; stay where thou art." The reading of Sept., Vulg., Syr., Arab.: "thou hast come *from* thy place," does not warrant us in changing the preposition "to" of the Heb. into "from;" for, if the latter were the original text, it is hard to see how the present difficult reading came. [The passage reads literally: "Return, and abide with the king, for thou art a stranger and also an exile to thy place." Eng. A. V. transposes the last phrase, or supposes a parenthesis: "return to thy place and abide," *etc.* (and so Kimchi), and *Bib.-Com.*: "Return and dwell with the king (for thou art a foreigner and thou art an exile) at thy place" (*i. e.* Jerusalem). Erdmann in his translation of the chapter (prefixed to the Exposition) gives: "for thou art a stranger and moreover a man that has been carried away from his place," but here renders it quite differently: "for thou art a stranger and an exile in thy place," that is, remaining quietly in thy place (Jerusalem, thy adopted home). Philippson: "thou art a stranger, *etc.*, in respect to thy place" (Gath, thy native place). The parenthesis of Eng. A. V. is improbable, and Erdmann's rendering in the Exposition is impossible; we must adopt Philippson's, or change the Prep. and read "from," as Erdmann in his translation. See the discussion in "Text. and Gram." —Tr.]—Whether Ittai came with his family (ver. 22) and his kinsfolk (ver. 20) to Jerusalem as *hostage* (Thenius), or *went over* to David with other warriors (Ewald), cannot be determined, as nothing is said thereon. But as he was a man in high position and a distinguished military leader, and as David broke the Philistines' supremacy in the last war with them (viii. 1), it is probable (ver. 20: "thou camest yesterday") that this victory of David's was the occasion of his coming to Jerusalem.—Ver. 20. The sense is: "Shall I drag* thee, a stranger lately come, and an exile, into my unquiet and precarious life?" **Since I go whither I go**, without certain aim, "whither the way leads me" (Maurer). Comp. 1 Sam. xxiii. 13.—David wishes Ittai the *favor* and the *faithfulness* of God. From this and from Ittai's saying: "as the Lord lives," it is probable that Ittai with his whole house had already become a believer in the God of Israel. [From this expression we cannot infer anything as to Ittai's religious position, much less as to that of his family. Any foreigner might believe in Jehovah as a deity and swear by His name (so Achish, 1 Sam. xxix. 6) without giving up his own gods. On general grounds it is not improbable that Ittai accepted the God of Israel; but we have no information as to any special religious depth or conversion in his history.—Tr.] It is doubtful whether we should render: "carry thy brethren back with thee in grace and truth" (Maurer), or take the latter part separately: "with thee be grace and truth," that is, God's (Keil); the accents favor the first, the connection of thought the second. Sept. and Vulg. have: "and the Lord will do with thee grace and truth," to which Vulg. adds: "because thou hast shown grace and faithfulness," whence Thenius (with Ew. and Böttch. for the Sept. reading) will correspondingly change the Heb. text.† But the words of Sept. and Vulg. seem to be an interpreting paraphrase, with the similar words in ii. 5, 6, in mind. The text without this addition gives a good sense: "lead thy brethren back; with thee be grace and faithfulness."

Ver. 21. *Ittai's answer* expresses unconditional devotion and fidelity for life and death.‡—Ver.

---

* לִמְקוֹמֶךָ, the לְ as *Dat. commod.*

* Instead of the Kethib אֲנוּעֲךָ [Qal] read the Qeri אֲנִיעֲךָ, Hiph. of נוּעַ, "to waver, wander." [Böttcher thinks the Qeri an old Qal with the force of Hiphil. —Tr.]

† ויהוה יַעֲשֶׂה עִמְּךָ וגו׳, so Then., Böttcher and Ew. after Sept.; כִּי עָשִׂיתָ חֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת, so Thenius [to which latter Böttcher objects, and calls it a medieval gloss. Martianæus explains that Jerome in this addition gives what he thought was contained in David's wish.—Tr.]

‡ The Kethib כִּי אִם — "surely," is to be retained against the Qeri כִּי. Comp. Gen. xl. 1; Job xlii. 8; Ew.,

22. David accepts Ittai's vow of fidelity. The latter with his whole family (wife and children, טַף, comp. Ex. xii. 37) remains in the line of march.—Ver. 23. Description of the deep and loud *lamentation* of all the faithful people over the misfortune of their king. "All the land" = all the inhabitants who poured out with the procession; "all the people" = David's courtiers and servants, were "passing by," namely, in front of these crowds of people standing on the way-side. The procession marched eastward **over the brook Kedron**, it being David's aim to reach the wilderness of Judah [that is, between Jerusalem and Jericho]. The *Kedron*, filled with water only in the winter or rainy season, was in the valley of Jehoshaphat, east of Jerusalem, between the city and Mount Olivet. David passed "in the direction of the way"* to the wilderness, the northern part of the wilderness of Judah.

Vers. 24–29. The *priests sent back* with the ark to Jerusalem.—Ver. 24. *Zadok* (of the branch of Eleazar) with the priests took the ark from its place (ch. vi.), brought it out to David, and set it down where he halted (after passing the Kidron) *on the declivity of the mount of Olives*, "to give the people that were yet coming on time to join the procession" (Keil). On the other hand *Abiathar* (of the line of Eli [branch of Ithamar]) had remained in the city "till the people had all passed over from the city." He *went up*, that is, of course, to the summit of Mount Olivet, where the ark was set down; the rendering: "he sacrificed" (Schultz, Böttcher), is impossible, since the verb (עלה) never has this meaning except in connection with the substantive "burnt-offering" (עוֹלָה) [or some other offering, Isa. lvii. 6. —Tr.], or without reference to it in the connection; in the passages cited by Böttcher, 1 Sam. ii. 28; 2 Sam. xxiv. 22; 1 Kings iii. 15, the context points to offering. Thenius proposes to read: "and Abiathar *waited*,"† for which there is no necessity, as the text in the connection (in respect to the locality) gives a good sense.—[Böttcher: "And Zadok, *etc.*, bearing the ark, *etc.*, of God, and Abiathar the son of Ahimelech at the head of all the Levites, and they set down the ark of God, and Abiathar offered sacrifices until," *etc.*, an improbable reading, in which the inserted clause is suggested by the Sept. ἀπὸ Βαιθάρ = Abiathar. Wellhausen acutely suggests that the words: "and Abiathar went up (or, offered sacrifices)," are in the wrong place; the text reads: "they set down the ark till all the people," *etc.* It is hard to get any good sense from the present text, or to explain what part Abiathar took in the proceedings. Some think he staid in the city till the ark was set down; others (contrary to the text) that he preceded the ark, which was not set down till he stopped. Probably Abiathar ought to be somehow connected with Zadok in the bearing of the ark (see the plural "your" in ver. 27), and perhaps in sacrificing; but we have not the means of satisfactorily restoring the text.—Tr.]—Ver. 25 sqq. *The ark sent back*. David declares that he does not need this sign of God's gracious presence and protection. His *reason* for this is expressed in the words [ver. 26]: "if I find favor," *etc.*, wherein in contrast with the visible sign of God's presence he emphasizes His spiritual nearness, on which everything depends, and gives himself unconditionally up to the will of the Lord, whom he knows to be present, whose hand he sees in these events, according to the announcement made him by Nathan. He resigns himself to God in the proper sense of the word for "favor or disfavor." David speaks only to *Zadok*, who here (as in in ver. 24) appears as the officiating high-priest at the head of the Levites. [But from 1 Kings ii. 35 it seems that Abiathar was the superior (*Bib.-Com.*, Bähr on "Kings" (Lange's *Bible-work*), Patrick). It is not improbable that some mention of Abiathar has here fallen out of the text (see ver. 29); though it may be that in the distribution of duties the care of the ark fell to Zadok. The two priests are throughout this narrative represented as equally faithful to David.—Tr.]—Ver. 27 sqq. [The king says to Zadok: Return to the city, and I will await word from you at the fords.] The word הראה [Eng. A. V. *seer*] presents great difficulties if we adopt the interrogative pointing, and render: "Seest thou not?" (Grot.), where the insertion of the negative is unwarranted, or: "Seest thou?" (De Wette), or: "Understandest thou?" namely, what I have just said (Böttcher), which renderings are partly too heavy, partly superfluous. [These translations take the word as Participle. Eng. A. V. takes it as a substantive, and unwarrantably inserts a negative, leaving out which, the rendering: "art thou a seer?" is grammatically possible, but not suitable to the circumstances.—Tr.] Instead of the Interrogative particle (הֲ) we must read the Article (הָ), and render: "Thou seer," that is, thou prophet, "since a high-priest might certainly bear this higher, yet archaic name" (Ewald). The high-priest might well be called a seer, because he received divine revelations through the Urim and Thummim. David's reason for so naming him here is found in his words in ver. 25 sqq. Zadok is to return to Jerusalem and learn God's will through events, and through him David is to learn whether the Lord will again take him into favor and restore him to Jerusalem; that is, Zadok was to act as seer for him.—[This interpretation is hardly conveyed by the words. Zadok was to act as observer, as reporter or intermediary between Hushai and David, and in fact does so act. But he performs none of the functions of the official Roeh or Seer, and it is not easy to see why he should be so called. Usage forbids us to take the word in its literal sense: "seeer" = observer. Wellhausen's reading: "high-priest" (ראש) belongs to a later time, and that of the Sept. "see!" (רְאֵה) seems to offer fewer difficulties than any other.—Tr.]—Ahimaaz and Jonathan the sons of the two high-

§ 356 *b*. The second כִּי = "yea!" or is a simple particle of introduction = ὅτι [" that"].

* עַל־פְּנֵי דֶרֶךְ אֶת־הַמִּדְבָּר.—[On the text see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

† וַיָּחֶל [from חול; Böttcher rejects the form as unsupported (in Gen. viii. 10 Qeri he reads Piel).—Tr.]

priests are to be the messengers to bring news from Jerusalem; comp. ver. 28 and ver. 36.—In ver. 28 we retain (from xvii. 6 comp. with xix. 19) the Kethib or text: "the fords of the wilderness" (instead of the Qeri "plains"* [so Eng. A. V.], 2 Kings xxv. 5), the point where one passed from the wilderness over the Jordan. Thither (to the west side of the Jordan) David had to repair in order to escape any threatening danger by crossing the river at one of the several fords in the vicinity; and there he would await information from Jerusalem. Comp. the Jordan-fords, Josh. ii. 7; Judg. iii. 28.—Ver. 29. The ark is carried back to Jerusalem, and the two high-priests remain there.

Vers. 30-37. Continuation of the *flight* on the road to the wilderness of Judah over the Mount of Olives.—Ver. 30. David went up **the height of the olive trees**, that is, Mount Olivet [Eng. A. V.: the ascent (or acclivity) of Mount Olivet]. Deep and loud mourning of David and all the faithful people that accompanied him. "Covering the head" is the symbol of the mind sorrowfully sunk in itself, wholly withdrawn from the outer world. Comp. Esth. vi. 12; Ezek. xxiv. 17. Of David it is said besides that he went "barefoot," "as a penitent" (Ewald), or: "to manifest his humiliation in the sight of God" (Thenius).—Ver. 31. "It was told David,"† he learned from Jerusalem, that the crafty Ahithophel (see on ver. 12) was "among the conspirators" with Absalom. He replies only by a brief ejaculation, praying the Lord "to make foolish the counsel of Ahithophel," that is, to bring it to naught.—Ver. 32. The fulfilment of this prayer is straightway prepared by the arrival of *Hushai*, the old, faithful friend of David, see xvii. 1 sq.—David came **to the top**, that is, of Mount Olivet, its highest point, whither David had come after ascending from the height below on the declivity (comp. ver. 24 with ver. 30); for there only can have been the place **where men were wont to worship**. By some (Sept., Vulg., Ew.) [Eng. A. V.]) "David" is taken as the subject of the verb "worshipped;" but then an Infin. with Prep. "to" (לְ) must have been employed, or a Pers. Pron. (הוּא) inserted before the verb (Böttch.). This place on the top of Mount Olivet, therefore, was one of the *Bamoth* or high places, which still existed in various places in Palestine.—*Hushai* was a trusted, proved counsellor of the king, as appears from the duties assigned him (ver. 33 sq.). That he was in close friendship with the king is shown by his repeated designation as "David's friend," ver. 37; xvi. 16; 1 Chr. xxvii. 33.—*The Arkite*, from the city Erek in Ephraim, on its south border near Atharoth (Josh. xvi. 2). Hushai came *to meet* David, had consequently preceded him in the flight [or else, had been out of the city]. The "torn garment and the earth on the head" betoken his grief, comp. 1 Sam. iv. 12. [According to Braun this garment was like a surplice, with sleeves, worn commonly by men of rank and position (Patrick).—Tr.]—Ver. 33 sq.—David, however, suggests to Hushai to return to Jerusalem. **If thou pass on with me, thou wilt be a burden to me**—why, it is not said. Ewald thinks it was because he was not used to war; but the matter in hand now was not war, but flight. Clericus supposes that he was a talented and prudent man, but not a warrior, and so Keil. Thenius: "thou wouldst thus increase my cares." Probably David thinks that Hushai would impede his flight, either because he was old, or because, as the king's intimate friend and confidential counsellor he would require special care. By entering Absalom's service, he thinks, Hushai may foil Ahithophel's plans (ver. 34), and through the priests' sons keep him informed of the state of affairs in Jerusalem. Hushai is to say to Absalom: **Thy servant, O king, I will be; thy father's servant was I formerly; but now—well,* I am thy servant.** [This was not honest, but it was according to the policy practiced in those days, and indeed in all ages. Which Procopius Gazæus approves so far as to say that "a lie told for a good end is equivalent to truth." But I dare not justify such doctrine (Patrick).—Tr.]—[Vers. 35, 36. Zadok and Abiathar and their sons are to participate in the stratagem of Hushai, and their moral position in the matter is perhaps the same as his and David's. Bp. Patrick's judgment above cited is hardly too severe. This was not an ordinary stratagem; these men, Zadok and the rest, were not simply spies, but we can avoid calling them traitors only by supposing that the priests were not recognized as adherents of Absalom, but as indifferent non-combatants, or as friends of David.—Tr.]—Ver. 37. Hushai returned to Jerusalem at the same time† that Absalom entered the city. The addition of the Vulg.: "and Ahithophel with him" was occasioned, no doubt, by xvi. 15 (Thenius).

xvi. 1-14. *Two disturbing experiences* in David's flight continued from the summit of the Mount of Olives.—1) Vers. 1-4. *Meeting with Ziba*, and the latter's calumny against Mephibosheth.—Ver. 1. **When David was a little past the top** [of Olivet], the point where he met Hushai (xv. 32). On *Ziba*, Mephibosheth's servant, see ix. 2 sq. He came *to meet* David, had therefore gone on in advance of the army (as Hushai did) in order more easily to secure David's attention after the

* עֲבָרוֹת instead of עַרְבוֹת.

† Instead of הֻגַּד read (after Sept., Vulg., Chald., Cod. Kenn. 254) with Thenius הֻגַּד, or with Ewald (§ 131 *d*) הֻגִּיד (an unusual Hophal-form). הִגִּיד with Accus. of the person informed (instead of the usual לְ) occurs, indeed, in some passages (Job xxxi. 37; xxvi. 4; Ezek. xliii. 10); but the rendering: "David announced" (Mich., Schulz, Gesen.), as if David had known it before, and had only kept silence out of consideration for his friends, gives no sense appropriate to the connection, since the next sentence: "And David said," *etc.*, necessarily presupposes that information has just been received. Nor do other constructions, such as the supplying a מַגִּיד [informant] (Maurer), or the change of דָּוִד to לְדָוִד taking the verb impersonally: "one told David" (Keil [Eng. A. V.]), or the change of וְדָוִד to וְדֶרֶךְ with impersonal construction of the verb: "and on the way one announced" (Böttch.), commend themselves, because of their arbitrariness and violent character.

* The apodosis is both times introduced by וַאֲנִי, comp. Ew. § 348 *a*.

† On synchronousness expressed by וְ with following Impf. (here יָבוֹא) see Ew. § 346 *b*.

first disorder was over. On two saddled asses he brings a quantity of food, two hundred loaves of bread, one hundred cakes of raisins or dried grapes, one hundred cakes of fruit [probably fig-cakes] (παλάθαι, comp. the Sept. in Jer. xl. 10, 12) and a skin of wine.—Ver. 2. Ziba states his purpose in bringing this food.* [His gift was particularly thoughtful and seasonable.—Tr.]—His real wish was to gain the king's favor and gratitude, he being shrewd enough to see that David would come out victor over his son.—Ver. 3. David asks: "where is the son (Mephibosheth) of thy lord (Jonathan)?"; to which he replies with the calumny, that Mephibosheth had stayed in Jerusalem, hoping to regain the kingdom of his father (Jonathan), who, if he had outlived Saul, would have been king. That the helpless cripple had designs on the throne, was an evident lie. But David might now believe it, partly because the present excitement prevented quiet consideration and opened his mind to such an insinuation, partly because he feared the Sauline party, dissatisfied with his government, might use the confusion produced by Absalom's insurrection to restore Saul's dynasty under the name of the last scion of his house. The aim of Ziba in this calumny (xix. 25 sqq. proves it undoubtedly to have been such) was to get possession of the estate committed to him for Mephibosheth's benefit (ix. 7 sq.), comp. xix. 27–29. The manner of Ziba's trick was this (xix. 26): Mephibosheth, learning of David's flight, had ordered asses saddled for himself and his servants, in order to repair to the king in token of his faithful attachment; Ziba had taken the asses together with the presents intended by Mephibosheth for the king, come to the latter, and left the helpless Mephibosheth in the lurch. He was therefore not only an arrant liar and calumniator, but also an impudent thief and traitor.†—Ver. 4. Another example of David's credulity and haste. He believes Ziba without investigation, and bestows on him all his master's property. The impudent swindler replies to this grace with two words: 1) **I bow myself**, that is, I manifest my most humble and devoted thanks; 2) **may I find favor in the eyes of my lord, the king**. I commend myself to your further good-will, comp. 1 Sam. i. 18. David, in the excitement of momentary misfortune, is here guilty of a double wrong, first in treating the faithful Mephibosheth as a traitor, and then in royally rewarding the false and slanderous Ziba.

2) Vers. 5–14. *Shimei curses David.* The flight reaches *Bahurim*, on the position of which place see on iii. 16, Thenius *in loco* and Käuffer's *bibl. Stud.* II. 154.—[It was between Mount Olivet and the Jordan, but the exact site is unknown.—Tr.]—**Shimei was of the race of Saul's house.**—[See the lists in Gen. xlvi. 21; 1 Chr. viii. 1 sqq. Some identify him (but doubtfully) with the Cush of the title of Ps. vii.—Tr.] This explains his rage against David, which he here vents in curses and revilings and in throwing stones at him and his followers. [Such virulence is to this day exhibited in the East towards fallen greatness. Josephus states (*Ant.* 7, 9, 7) that Bahurim lay off the main road, which agrees very well with the account of Shimei's behaviour (Smith's *Bib.-Dict.*, Art. Bahurim).—Tr.]—Ver. 7 sqq. **Out, out**, namely, out of the kingdom and the land. He calls David "thou *bloody man*" probably because he ascribed to him the murder of Ishbosheth and Abner (iii. 27 sqq.; iv. 6 sqq.), of which he was wholly guiltless. [Others, less probably, think also of Saul and Jonathan, and even of Uriah.—Tr.] The *misfortune* [Eng. A. V. not so well "mischief"] that Absalom's insurrection had brought on him he regards as a punishment from God, because he had become king in Saul's stead. This shows how embittered Saul's kindred were over David's elevation to the throne, and how, therefore, Ziba's slander against Mephibosheth found readier acceptance with David. [Shimei is here so far devout and religious that he ascribes the present state of things wholly to Jehovah, the God of Israel; but he ignores Samuel's sentence of rejection (1 Sam. xv.), and otherwise shows a bad spirit.—Tr.]—Ver. 9. [*Abishai wishes to kill Shimei.*] On *Abishai* compare ii. 23 sq.; iii. 30. The "dead dog" is the expression of the extremest vileness and badness, comp. ix. 8. Abishai appears here as in chaps. ii., iii. [and 1 Sam. xxvi. 8] violent and revengeful. He wishes to make Shimei atone for his reviling with his head.—Ver. 10. [David restrains Abishai.]—**Ye sons of Zeruiah.** Joab is here joined with his brother (as in ii. 23), being probably of the same opinion with him. "What is there to me and to you?" (comp. John ii. 4, τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί; Josh. xxii. 24; 1 Kings xvii. 18; for the thought comp. Luke ix. 52–56), that is, what have I in common with you? [Eng. A. V.: what have I to do with you?]. David decidedly repels Abishai's suggestion, saying: I have here no feeling in common with you; we are different persons; I will have nothing to do with you in such self-help and revenge. He bases this strict *prohibition* on the *admonition* that Shimei's cursing is by dispensation of God. The marginal reading: "so let him curse, for the Lord" [so Eng. A. V.], and the insertion of Sept. and Vulg.: "and let him alone" (following the "let him alone" of ver. 11) after "sons of Zeruiah," are explanations owing their origin to the difficulty that the text presented when the first particle (כִּי) was taken as causal (= "for" or "because"), the second (וְכִּי) being then very harsh. Render both particles by "when," and begin the apodosis with "and who" (וּמִי). Maurer: "when he curses and when Jehovah has said to him, Curse David, who then shall say," *etc.**—Ver. 11 sq. David here combines Shimei's cursing and Absalom's revolt under the point of view of the divine permission and causation; and the fresh reference to this divine cause shows how deeply in his pious heart David feels in this misfortune also the blows of God's chastening hand. "The

* For Kethib ולהלחם (an obvious clerical error) read וְהִלָּחֵם. [Some MSS. and edd. have this Qeri in the text.—Tr.]

† ["It is impossible to say whether Mephibosheth was quite guiltless or not. If Ps. cxvi. was composed after the quelling of Absalom's rebellion, ver. 11 may contain David's confession of a hasty judgment in the matter" (*Bib. Com.*)—Tr.]

* [On the text see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

repetition of the: **And he said**, is not superfluous, for the discourse is addressed to *more persons* than before" (Thenius). **How much more the Benjamite**, that is, the member of Saul's tribe, who hate me. It is not surprising that such a one reviles me, when my own son seeks my life. David thus shows that from a purely *human* point of view there was no ground for the course proposed by Abishai.—Ver. 12. "Perhaps the Lord will look on my iniquity." Instead of this (עֲוֹנִי) the Qeri or margin has "my eye" (עֵינִי), that is, the Lord will perhaps look on "my tears," the Masorites [ancient Jewish editors of the Heb. text] not being able to comprehend how David, guiltless in respect to this reviling, could acknowledge himself guilty. We are not, however, to change the text to "my affliction" (עָנְיִי, Then., Ew. [Eng. A. V.]), but to retain the idea of *guilt*, since David deeply feels that he has offended, not, indeed, in the matter mentioned by Shimei, but against the Lord. God's "looking on His iniquity" can then be only a gracious and merciful looking. "Perhaps the Lord will requite me good for the curse that has come on me this day," since I patiently bear it as a chastisement of His hand. Retain the text "my curse" = the curse that has befallen me, against the Qeri "his curse" [Eng. A. V.], that is, Shimei's. [It seems more in accordance with the thought here to read "my affliction" instead of "my iniquity;" see "Text. and Gram." David's humility is seen in his "perhaps;" he will not be sure of the divine blessing (Patrick). His feeling towards Shimei here seems to be controlled by an overpowering sense of God's chastising providence. He does not exonerate his reviler, but feels that at this moment it is not his business to assert his right, but only to bow under God's hand. The misfortune that has befallen him is so terrible that he thinks Shimei's addition to it only natural. Afterwards (xix. 23) under the generous impulses of victory, he pardons him, but finally (1 Kings ii. 8, 9) hands him over to Solomon's vengeance. Whatever his feeling in this last act, it is clear that now his humble sense of God's chastisement has driven all self-assertion and revenge from his heart.—Tr.].—Ver. 13. Shimei's rage is increased, it would seem, by David's quiet behaviour; he runs along the side of the acclivity (by which the road passed) *opposite him*, cursing and throwing stones at David and his followers.—Ver. 14. David's arrival in "*Ajephim*" [Eng. A. V.: "weary"]. A place of this name, indeed, is not known; but that is no ground against its existence. If the word be rendered "weary," no place is named to which they came, as the word "there" indicates. This place was certainly not Bahurim [ver. 5], for xvii. 18 shows that David's rest-place was beyond Bahurim towards the Jordan, the priests' sons having hidden at Bahurim, and then gone on farther towards David. [*Bib. Com.* suggests that Ajephim was a caravansary, for which the meaning of the word (weary) would be appropriate.—Tr.].—The exact statement of the localities of David's flight [and, indeed, of the whole history of the day of flight—Tr.] is remarkable; comp. xv. 17, 23, 30, 32; xvi. 1, 5, 13, 14.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The *starting-point* of the *shattering of the theocratic kingdom* till its very existence was threatened is found in the disruption of David's *house and family* by the crimes of his two oldest sons. From the royal household itself comes the seducer of the people to conspiracy and insurrection against the divinely ordained government of David. From the morally corrupt soil of the royal court, whose highest officials break faith and rise against the kingly government, springs the evil spirit (the confederate of that seducer) that drags the people into revolution. But the success of Absalom and his accomplice shows that *in the nation itself* there was already dissension with the Davidic government and a process of disintegration that co-operated with Absalom's act of insurrection; if there had not been widespread dissatisfaction at defects and wrongs in *administration of justice*, Absalom's treacherous conduct could not have had so great and immediate results. If the bonds of *fidelity and obedience*, which before held the people to David, had not been sorely loosened, Absalom could not have straightway turned "the heart of the men of Israel" from him. And it is David's own tribe, *Judah*, whence the rebellion proceeds and is carried on. Absalom's general-in-chief is Amasa, a near kinsman of Joab and David; his counsellor is Ahithophel of Giloh in Judah; and the insurrection begins at Hebron, the old capital of the tribe. "There must, therefore, have been dissatisfaction in David's own tribe. Indeed this tribe murmurs and holds back after Absalom is slain, and the other tribes submit. The hereditary tribe jealousy and the old opposition between Judah and the others, are not extinct" (Ew. Hist. III., p. 239). The first impulse to the insurrection was given in Judah, and in Judah its effects are longest to be seen.

If we inquire, indeed, concerning the *innermost grounds and causes* of the insurrection and the national disintegration, we must first and chiefly note the *treachery* of Absalom and his accomplice, which was combined with *hypocrisy* and with kindness offered as a bribe, and, on the other hand, the fickleness and *unfaithfulness* of the people. The *ambition* of Absalom and his associates used all means to befool the people and win their favor. And during time of peace the God-fearing sense that saw in David the Anointed of the Lord, the God-chosen king, had been lost by a great part of the *people*. Perhaps, also, David had erred in the government of the *nation* and *State* as of his *house*, and was partly to blame for the popular dissatisfaction. All these ethical factors combined to produce the present disintegration.—But, over against this manifold *human guilt*, David, looking at his present misfortune from the highest point of view, the theocratic, recognizes in it a *divine punishment* (comp. xii. 10, 11), beneath which he humbly bows. Such a recognition is contained in his *flight* without attempt to withstand the insurrection. He goes his way a fugitive in *tears*, bowing humbly and quietly beneath God's hand. "*The Lord* hath commanded him"—this is the expression of his submission to God. This is the source of his humble *tranquillity*, as he pursues

his fugitive way, of his childlike *submission* to God's will ("let Him do to me as seemeth Him good") and of the *gentle patience* with which he takes men's wickedness without return in word or deed, and bears it as a dispensation of God. But in all this there shows itself at the same time the *fruit* of this sorrowful experience: it proves to him a real *visitation;* he turns anew to his God with humble obedience and childlike trust; having obtained forgiveness of sins, he makes these sufferings as a paternal chastisement minister to the purification and sanctification of his heart and mind. "Only through new wrestling with the divine grace, only through humble submission to Jehovah's righteous chastisement can he succeed in passing safely through this valley of death-shade."

2. Penitent humility shows itself in the truly pious in patient endurance of ills that they must recognize as the consequence of their own guilt and accept as a chastisement and means of purification, as well as in the rejection of the self-willed efforts of others to ward off the evil or take vengeance on its originators.

3. To this period is to be referred (with most expositors) the origin of Psalm xli. and lv. Both Psalms have, as Delitzsch rightly observes, "the most marked historical, individual physiognomy;" they are mourning Psalms, picturing the hostility and falseness of numerous adversaries of the singer, and especially lamenting the faithlessness of a trusted friend and counsellor, with whom his numerous enemies are combined. The statement in 2 Sam. xvi. 23 shows how near Ahithophel stood to David as friend and counsellor, and how much importance the latter attached to his counsel. According to Ps. xli. a long sickness of the Psalmist is the occasion for his enemies to employ all their false and treacherous arts against him. In the midst of this suffering he implores the divine mercy and help, recognizing and bearing the suffering as chastisement for sin, yet affirms his conviction of God's favor towards him as His servant, the uprightness of his heart, his firm confidence in the saving grace of the Lord, who will not let his enemies triumph over him, and (without expressing any revengeful desires, Hupfeld), holds in view the just requital that will overtake his enemies, "to which he, as a just king, was pledged" (Moll). In Ps. lv. the abruptness of the words, the excited haste of the discourse and the anguished tone of the Psalmist indicate a worsened situation, the extreme danger from the insurrection, which had now flamed openly out. By the hostility of his opponents he is brought to uttermost distress (vers. 2–6 [Eng. A. V. 1–5]). He wishes for the wings of a dove, to find a refuge in the *wilderness* (7–9 [6–8]), while in the *city* and on its walls are violence and deceit (10–12 [9–11]), and a formerly *trusted friend* and *companion* joins his enemies (13–15 [12–14]), who are united with the hypocritical and faithless man (21, 22 [20, 21]). On these enemies he invokes destruction as divine punishment for their insurrection against the Lord's Anointed, and for their wickedness from which they do not turn (16–20 [15–19]). In this extreme need (corresponding exactly to the situation at the beginning of Absalom's rebellion) the Psalmist *exhorts* his own soul to *bear patiently* the *burden* of suffering sent by the Lord, or rather, to cast it on Him, and expresses the *firm hope* and *confidence*, that the Lord will deliver the righteous by *punishing* evil-doers, concluding with the energetic exclamation of unconditional trust in God:—"But I, I trust in Thee!"—These traits of humble *submission* to God's will and confident *hope* in His help answer precisely to David's frame of mind as given in history. [The correctness of the foregoing historical explanation of these two Psalms is very doubtful. Ps. xli. was written while the author was still on a bed of sickness (ver. 11 [10]), as David certainly was not when he heard of Ahithophel's treachery. The alleged connection between the two Psalms as portraying the rise and full bursting-forth of the rebellion is impossible; for David did not hear of it till it was consummated. As to Ps. lv., its writer seems to be in the city (vers. 9–12 [8–11]), nor does the history say anything of such intimate relations between David and Ahithophel as are indicated in ver. 15 [14]; it was Hushai that was David's *friend*.—Of course the religious value of these Psalms is not affected by our ignorance of their date and authorship.—Tr.]

4. This event of David's history is of typical significance for the sufferings of Jesus in connection with the betrayal of Judas Iscariot, of which Jesus (John xiii. 18) says, referring to Ps. xli. 10 [9] ("he that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me") that it happened "that the Scripture might be fulfilled." The Old Testament prediction of the betrayal, assumed in John xvii. 12 and Acts i. 16 must be found (according to our Lord's reference to Ps. xli. 10 [9]) in the treachery of Ahithophel, and the fate of Judas in his fate. [This view of typical significance falls of course with the failure to establish the connection of Ps. xli. with this history. Our Lord's reference in John xiii. 18 is not necessarily more than a very general one. Acts i. 16 refers (see ver. 20) to Pss. cix. 8 and lxix. 26 [25]. Since David suffered for his own sins, and had probably grievously wronged Ahithophel (see note on 2 Sam. xv. 12) it is hardly allowable to make him herein typify Christ, and to regard Ahithophel as the forerunner of Judas.—Tr.]—Further, the separate incidents of David's flight are strikingly parallel to the Lord's way over the same path when He was betrayed by Judas. Though David suffered for his many sins, he had yet through penitence already obtained forgiveness of sins. Thus he was the righteous sufferer, who could appeal to God for the purity of his heart and the holiness of his cause. And for this reason he may be regarded as a type of Christ, as indeed Christ Himself by His reference to the passage in Ps. xli. establishes this typical connection.

5. It is noteworthy, how this break-down in David's theocratic government by his own fault, through family-insurrection and popular defection, led to its restoration and confirmation. "We may say: just as David falls away from Jehovah, to be more firmly bound to him, so Israel turns away from David, to be (as the close of the history shows) more devotedly attached to him. The prelude to this first clearing-up of the relations between king and people is given in the conduct of the faithful band who stand firmly by David in the general defection" (Baumgarten). God's in-

struments for building up His kingdom often sorely injure it by their sins, but receive therefor the deepest humiliations through God's righteous chastisements, and must to their shame admit that He does not for their sin give His cause over to ruin, but raises it the more gloriously up from the fall occasioned by this sin—yea, uses them again as instruments to this end, in so far as they go not *their own* way in impenitent self-will (as Saul did), but (like David) with broken and grace-filled hearts go the Lord's way and give themselves up wholly to His will.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Proof of the complete resignation to the painful leadings of the Lord occasioned by one's own fall, 1) In humbly holding still under the strokes of God's hand, 2) In patiently enduring the sufferings inflicted by bad men, 3) In quietly awaiting the Lord's decision, whether He will exercise His grace or His justice towards us, and 4) In wisely using the means which please God for overcoming the evil, while decidedly rejecting tempting counsels that are against God's will.

[TAYLOR: Civil war is always a terrible calamity; but when the standard of rebellion is raised by a son against his father, we have about the most painful form of strife of which this earth can be the scene. . . . . That he whom we have fondled in our arms and nestled in our bosom, and whose first lisping utterances have been in the attempt to call us father, should live to be at deadly feud with us, and to attempt our destruction—this is misery indeed. "How sharper than a serpent's tooth it is to have a thankless child." —TR.]

FR. ARNDT: In the manner in which David bears this deserved suffering, he appears to us again as the man after God's own heart, in whom faith purified and strengthened by repentance had brought forth quite extraordinary steadfastness, fidelity and virtue-power, and revealed itself in a glory and elevation which throughout shines before us a picture worthy of imitation. This faith developed itself namely: 1) as obedience, 2) as resignation, 3) as prayer.

Chap. xv. 1–6. STARKE: When one winks at gross evil-doers too much, they become all the worse. That is the way with rude and wanton sinners; the more God attracts them by His goodness to repentance, the more they misuse it to greater and more numerous sins (Rom. ii. 4, 5).—BERL. B.: Even the proofs of grace which so greatly humble the souls that draw near to God with simplicity and uprightness, make hypocrites to be full of pride.—SCHLIER: Ambition plunges from one sin into another; by ambition no one comes to anything right.—[HENRY: Those are good indeed that are good in their own place, not that pretend how good they will be in other people's places. . . . . Those are commonly most ambitious of preferment, that are least fit for it; the best-qualified are the most modest and self-diffident.—HALL: No music can be so sweet, to the ears of the unstable multitude, as to hear well of themselves, ill of their governors.—SCOTT: For such is human nature, that these arts and attainments go much further in gaining the favor of the multitude, than wisdom and justice, truth and piety, or the most important and long-continued services. This is the old hackneyed way for men, destitute of conscience or honor, to wind themselves into important stations; and yet it is as much practiced, and as little suspected, as if it were quite a new discovery.—TR.]

Vers. 7–12. SCHLIER: How often it happens that piety is for us an outward thing, just as we put on a garment, and inwardly we are strangers to the matter.—Absalom's rebellion was the Lord's chastening. . . . . Even when we have found forgiveness, we must yet always feel the Lord's mighty hand; and this hand often lies quite heavily upon us.—[Ver. 11. HALL: How many thousands are thus ignorantly misled into the train of error; their simplicity is as worthy of pity, as their misguidance of indignation. Those that will suffer themselves to be carried with semblances of truth and faithfulness, must needs be as far from safety as innocence.—TR.]

Vers. 13 sqq. STARKE: The dear name of God and religion must always be to ungodly men a cloak for their wickedness.—S. SCHMID: How unfaithful the human heart is towards God, appears also from the unfaithful behaviour of men towards their greatest benefactors.—BERL. B.: David would rather be regarded as a timid man, than resist God. He regarded Absalom as an executor of God's righteousness; accordingly he yields only to God, not to Absalom.—One can scarcely imagine the manifold inventions of which God's strict love makes use, to crucify the converted souls that have once given themselves up thereto. It leaves nothing in them that is not overturned and annihilated. Before Thee, O Lord, all mountains must be made low and all valleys exalted.—STARKE: God makes even severe temptations endurable for His people (1 Cor. x. 13).—F. W. KRUMMACHER: This unexpected meeting (with Ittai) immediately before the gates of the city appeared to the royal fugitive almost like a friendly greeting of his God, and dropped the first soothing balsam-drops into the painful wounds of his deeply lacerated heart.—SCHLIER: Here we have an example of what true fidelity is, and how beautiful it is to remain faithful to one's king and lord. Fidelity becomes a man, and doubly becomes a Christian.

Ver. 25 sq. CRAMER: Everything that opposes thee, endure it, and be patient in every sort of trouble (Ecclus. ii. 4). For patience is the best way to win.—J. LANGE: Well for him who has so believing and open an eye that he can see through everything to God.

Ver. 30. SCHLIER: How instructive is this picture of David; how humble and yet at the same time how spiritual is Israel's king! Who can fail to see that David on the Mount of Olives goes up truly bowed and contrite, with an humbled and thoroughly softened heart? But David knew that the Lord cannot reject an humbled and broken heart. Therefore in all his humiliation he is not hopeless.—OSIANDER: The more patiently and humbly we submit ourselves to the cross, the sooner we are released from it.—BERL. B.: The too great strength which one supposes himself to possess, causes self-conceit; weakness, on the contrary, makes a man very little and lowly.—SCHLIER: Whence comes all despair, whence all little-faith? Is it not because we still hold ourselves too good?

And a thoroughly softened heart learns also more and more to take courage and be comforted, and believes ever more firmly that the Lord is kind to the humble.

Ver. 31. OSIANDER: The cunning and secret assaults of our enemies and those of the Gospel we can best bear up against and destroy through fervent prayer to God.—Even short prayers are mighty, if they only proceed from faith.—STARKE: God can take the wise in their craftiness (Job v. 13; 1 Cor. iii. 19). When wickedness is armed with cunning and power, none but God can overcome it.—Even when the need is greatest, God causes His grace to be seen, and creates means whereby the misfortune is a little softened.—SCHLIER: Here we see what David, who had before put all in the Lord's hand, did in order really to obtain the Lord's help. First of all David prayed. But after he has prayed he does not lay his hands in his bosom, but he does what he can to get help.—It is wrong to think we might manage the thing without prayer; but it is not less wrong if we think that prayer alone does it, and are disposed then not to do our duty also.

Chap. xvi. 1–4. [SCOTT: Selfish men often affect to appear generous in giving away the property of others for their own advantage, and are great adepts in address and insinuation. Flatterers are generally backbiters; for it is as easy to them to forge slanders of the absent, as to pretend affection and respect for the present.—TR.].—BERL. B.: Shameful as was this slander to David against the innocent Mephibosheth by the false earner of thanks and eye-servant, in like manner inexcusable is the credulity and forgetfulness of David towards his faithful friend, Jonathan, in that he is here so swift to give a decree against his son, and does not once investigate the accusation against him, but condemns him unheard, contrary to his own practical knowledge.—CRAMER: It is wrong to give a decision at once upon the allegations of one side, and to believe one party's account. Persons in authority should guard against this (Prov. xiv. 15). [*"Audi alteram partem."*—TR.]

Vers. 5–14. STARKE: Judgment begins at the house of God (1 Pet. iv. 17). Who need wonder then if Christ and all holy men of God have been the world's execration and off-scourings?—SCHLIER: It is always wrong to scorn and revile an enemy; and doubly wrong when it is done to an unfortunate, whose sorrow without this might almost break his heart.—STARKE: Pious men should not murmur when they are chastened by the Lord, but should rather remember their sins, and recognize that after God's strict judgment they would well have deserved something more (Mic. vii. 9).—Even in righteous zeal one must take good account of the time; for an untimely zeal, although righteous, amounts to nothing.—SCHLIER: The Lord controls even the sin of men, and where something evil has been devised in one's heart, God takes even the evil into His service, and does not suffer it to do what the man wishes, but God does with it what He wishes. Therefore David bows, not indeed to that insolent man, but he bows to the Lord. He thinks of his sin; he confesses himself guilty and accepts even the injustice that is done him as a wholesome medicine. [HALL: Every word of Shimei was a slander. He that took Saul's spear from his head, and repented to have but cut the lap of his garment, is reproached as a man of blood. The man after God's own heart is branded for a man of Belial. He that was sent for out of the fields to be anointed, is taxed for an usurper; if David's hands were stained with blood, yet not of Saul's house. . . . It is not possible that eminent persons should be free from imputations; innocence can no more protect them than power.—TR.]

Ver. 9. BERL. B.: It is a strong sign of pride to take offence at everything.—CRAMER: Without God's permission nothing evil can befall the pious (Acts xviii. 10).—BERL. B.: Almost all men commit the fault of looking to those who persecute them, instead of fixing their eyes only on God and His holy command. And this causes all the great sufferings that are experienced in such a case, the bitterness and the aversion that are felt for persecutors. David also did indeed commit precisely this fault, when Nabal refused him bread, on which account he also repented afterwards. But as he has now gone further, everything comes to him as a command of God, and his eye discerns God's direction in everything. Therefore he suffered patiently, without growing indignant.—David is here above measure edifying in his behaviour, and beautifully teaches us in what way we should bear every sort of cross, and in all oppression, injustice and distress should bow and humble ourselves, not before man but before God from whom everything comes. There is nothing that amid all injustice and sufferings from men more quiets our mind and gives it peace than this consideration, that nothing befalls us through the wickedness of men without God's holy and wise government.—[MAURICE: To have his people's heart stolen from him, to have his child for his enemy, to be deserted by his counsellors, to lose his kingdom, to be mocked and cursed,—this was rough discipline surely. But he had desired it; he had said deliberately, "Make me a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within me." And that blessing,—if it was granted him in part at once, if he rose up from that very prayer a freed man with a free spirit,—yet was to be realized through his whole life and to be secured by methods which he certainly would not have devised or chosen for himself.—Ver. 11. HALL: Even while David laments the rebellion of his son, he gains by it, and makes that the argument of his patience, which was the exercise of it. The wickedness of an Absalom may rob his father of comfort, but shall help to add to his father's goodness. It is the advantage of great crosses, that they swallow up the less.—TR.]

Ver. 12. CRAMER: It is a great consolation in suffering, to have a good conscience (Ps. vii. 4; 1 Pet. iii. 16).—OSIANDER: If we patiently leave vengeance to God, we move Him to cover us with blessings in place of the evil we have suffered.—STARKE: Even in the midst of the cross we should not allow our hope and trust in God to sink (Heb. x. 35; Rom. v. 3–5).—BERL. B.: David suffers the evil with a gentle, quiet and humble spirit, and hopes that for this evil God will send him good. And this hope did not deceive him.—Ver. 13. David acted like one who does not turn at the barking of a dog, and thereby gives you this les-

son: If you know well what you have inwardly within yourself, you will not care what men say outwardly about you.—SCHLIER: We should receive as from the Lord's hand the wrongs that assail us, and if men insult and revile us we should not look at men but at the Lord, who rules and guides every thing.—[WORDSWORTH: S. Gregory observes that David was thus brought to a deeper sense of his own sins, and was exercised in true repentance, and so found cause to be thankful for these indignities, which made him nearer and dearer to God. It was a wise saying of S. Chrysostom that "no man is ever really hurt by any one but himself." And even the heathen poet could bless heaven for injuries, and say, "It is a most wretched fortune to have no enemy."— HALL: In good dispositions, injury unanswered grows wearied of itself, and dies in a voluntary remorse; but evil natures grow presumptuous upon forbearance.—TR.]

[xv. 6. *Stealing the people's hearts.* 1) The king—his weak negligence in not preventing, nor even perceiving all this. Men in responsible positions should be always on their guard. 2) The demagogue; *a*) his ostentation (ver. 1), *b*) his painstaking (vers. 2, 6), *c*) his flatteries (vers. 3, 5), *d*) his lavish promises (ver. 4). 3) The people—their folly in being duped by transparent arts—the net spread in their very sight, and they go in (Prov. i. 17).—TR.]

[Vers. 7, 8. To make pretended *devoutness* a cloak for wicked designs, is one of the most heinous sins a man can possibly commit.—Vers. 19–21. David and Ittai—unselfish generosity, and unselfish fidelity.—Vers. 25, 26. Sending back the ark. *a*) David does not suppose the presence of the ark to be a necessary condition of God's presence. Contrast 1 Sam. iv. 4, 5. *b*) He does not despair of God's favor. *c*) He is resigned to God's will. Comp. 1 Sam. iii. 18.—TR.]

[xvi. 5–13. *David and Shimei:* 1) The baseness of seizing a time of calamity to revile. And encouraged by finding it unpunished (ver. 13). Comp. xix. 19, 20. 2) The false accusations. As to "the house of Saul," David had been neither *a*) bloody, nor *b*) wicked in general. He was indeed "in his calamity" because of his sins, but they were not what Shimei charged. Revilers of the unfortunate often accuse falsely. 3) David's devout patience under gross insult. Represses the resentment of his nephew. *a*) This insult is a trifle compared with Absalom's course. *b*) David accepts the reviling as a punishment from Jehovah. *c*) He has hope that Jehovah may yet requite him for it (comp. xv. 25).—TR.]

---

2. Absalom in Jerusalem. His Evil Deed through Ahithophel's Evil Counsel. The Designs of the Latter against David thwarted by Hushai's Counsel.

CHAP. XVI. 15—XVII. 23.

15 AND Absalom and all the people the men of Israel[1] came to Jerusalem, and
16 Ahithophel with him. And it came to pass, when Hushai the Archite [Arkite]
David's friend[2] was come unto Absalom, that Hushai said unto Absalom, God
17 save [Long live] the king, God save [Long live] the king. And Absalom said to
Hushai, Is this thy kindness to thy friend? why wentest thou not with thy friend?
18 And Hushai said unto Absalom, Nay;[3] but whom the Lord [Jehovah] and this

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 15. This phrase, in which the "all the people" is put in apposition with "men of Israel" (not: "all the people of the men of Israel," as Erdmann renders), is peculiar, and is variously changed by the versions: Sept.: "all the men of Israel;" Syr., Arab.: "all the people that were with him, and all Israel;" Vulg.: "all his people." Sept. and Vulg. may have omitted half the expression for simplicity (and they retain different halves), and the Heb. text itself may be a duplet, arisen from a marginal explanation. Thenius: "Instead of these words (אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל) MS. Cantab. 1 has אֲשֶׁר אִתּוֹ (*added* by Syr. and Arab.), which came from the fact that in some MS. that was copied, the words א׳ יִשׂ׳ (men of Israel) stood *under* the אֲשֶׁר אִתּוֹ (that were with him) of the *preceding* verse (Kennicott, *sup. rat. text. Heb.*, 449)."—TR.]

[2] [Ver. 16. Sept.: ἀρχιεταῖρος (as above xv. 32) = 'Αρχὶ ἑταῖρος.—Hushai's address to Absalom is literally: "live the king! live the king!" given once only in Sept. and Arabic.—TR.]

[3] [Ver. 18. Thenius and Erdmann render: "Not (*i. e.* I go not with David), because," *etc.* But it is not likely that Hushai would make his negation with one word, and usage establishes the sense of the phrase given in Eng. A. V.: "nay, but," or, "nay, for," see Ges. Lex. *s. v.* לֹא 2.—The Kethib לֹא in this verse is approved by De Rossi against the Qeri לוֹ, which seems to be adopted by all the versions, even by Syriac and Arab., which make the sentence interrogative. The Kethib (לֹא) would be interrogative, and would require a preposition before אֲשֶׁר.—TR.]

people and all the men of Israel choose, his will I be, and with him will I abide.
19 And again [in the second place], whom should I serve? *should I* not *serve* in the
presence of his son?[4] as I have served in thy father's presence, so will I be in thy
presence.
20 Then said Absalom [And Absalom said] to Ahithophel, Give [*ins.* ye] counsel
21 among you [*om.* among you[5]] what we shall do. And Ahithophel said unto Ab-
salom, Go in unto thy father's concubines, which [whom] he hath left to keep the
house; and all Israel shall hear that thou art abhorred of [art become loathsome
to[6]] thy father, then [and] shall [*om.* shall] the hands of all that are with thee
22 [*ins.* shall] be strong. So [And] they spread Absalom a tent upon the top of the
house [on the roof], and Absalom went in unto his father's concubines in the sight
23 of all Israel. And the counsel of Ahithophel, which he counselled in those days,
was as if a man had inquired at the oracle [of the word] of God; so was all the
counsel of Ahithophel both with David and with Absalom.
CH. XVII. 1. MOREOVER [And] Ahithophel said unto Absalom, Let[7] me now
choose out twelve thousand men, and I will arise and pursue after David this night;
2 And I will come upon him while he is weary and weak-handed, and will make
him afraid, and all the people that are with him shall flee, and I will smite the
3 king only; And I will bring back all the people unto thee; the man whom thou
4 seekest is as if all returned;[8] *so* [*om.* so] all the people shall be in peace. And
5 the saying pleased Absalom well [*om.* well], and all the elders of Israel. Then
said Absalom [And Absalom said], Call now Hushai the Archite [Arkite] also,
6 and let us hear likewise [*om.* likewise] what he [*ins.* too] saith. And when Hu-
shai was come [And Hushai came] to Absalom, [*ins.* and] Absalom spake [said]
unto him, saying, Ahithophel hath spoken after this manner; shall we do after his
saying? if not, [after his saying, or not?][9] speak thou.
7 And Hushai said unto Absalom, The counsel that Ahithophel hath given is not
8 good at this time [hath given this time[10] is not good]. For, said Hushai [and
Hushai said], Thou knowest thy father and his men, that they be [are] mighty
men, and [*ins.* that] they be [are] chafed in their minds, as a bear robbed of her
whelps in the field;[11] and thy father is a man of war, and will not lodge with the
9 people. Behold, he is hid now in some pit [in one of the ravines] or in some *other*
place [in one of the places[12]]; and it will come to pass, when some of them be

[4] [Ver. 19. Arab.: "And 'tis not my business to be forever the servant of one man;" Syr.: "whose servant I shall be is not in my power." Instead of בנו Syr. had ידי (אידי), which Arab. read as אחר.—TR.]

[5] [Ver. 20. This *Dativus commodi* (לכם) cannot be here given well in English. The phrase: "give ye you counsel," is awkward, and in "give you counsel" the pronoun would be understood as Nominative.—TR.]

[6] [Ver. 21. The verb means: "to be in bad odor." The אֵת is the Prep. "with," not the sign of the Accus., as Sept. and Vulg. take it. Chald paraphrases: "that thou art stirred up against thy father." Syr. and Arab. explain: "that thou hast gone in to the concubines of thy father." Josephus interprets: "the people will believe that a reconciliation with thy father is impossible."—TR.]

[7] [Ver. 1. Or: "I will now choose . . . . and will arise." Sept. and Vulg.: "I will now choose me." Arab.: "choose thou . . . and let them go forth to seek David."—TR.]

[8] [Ver. 3. So Erdmann, Cahen, Wordsworth, *Bib.-Com.* Various other renderings are discussed by Erdmann in the Exposition. In addition to what he says it may be mentioned that Chald. renders nearly (as to the sense) as Eng. A. V.: "they will all return when the man that thou seekest is killed," — "as the return of all is [the killing of] the man," *etc.* (so Cahen). Syr.: "as if all the men that thou seekest returned," as if reading כָּל־הָאִישׁ; so Philippson: "at the return of all the men thou seekest." The translations proposed all either do violence to the text, or fail to suit the connection and give a good sense, or require a bold insertion (as of the phrase: "the killing of" in Chald. and Eng. A. V.).—TR.]

[9] [Ver. 6. Eng. A. V. renders according to the accents, and so Erdmann; but it is better (with Vulg., Cahen, Wellhausen) to take the sentence as a double question. Sept. inserts וְ (εἰ δὲ μή), which may easily have fallen out (from the preceding וְ), and is almost necessary for the rendering of Eng. A. V. It is found in some MSS. and EDD.—Instead of the more usual לֹא, we here have אַיִן, literally: "is there not" — "is our doing (according to Ahithophel's counsel) not?"—TR.]

[10] [Ver. 7. פַּעַם, the numeral, not the simple substantive "time" (עֵת). Sept.: τὸ ἅπαξ τοῦτο; Vulg.: *hac vice*; Cahen: *cette fois*; Erdmann: *dieses Mal.*—TR.]

[11] [Ver. 8. Sept. here inserts: καὶ ὡς ὗς τραχεῖα ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ, "and as a fierce sow in the plain," which addition is adopted by Ewald, Thenius and Böttcher on the ground of its appropriate poetic character, and as not likely to have been inserted by the Greek translator. To this Wellhausen replies that the two words ἀγρῷ and πεδίῳ of the Greek point to the same Heb. word (שדה), making the double figure improbable, and further that an Israelite would naturally think of the hog only as an unclean animal, and would not put it alongside of the bear.—TR.]

[12] [Ver. 9. The word "place" is here used in the sense of "locality" (*Bib.-Com.*) or "camping-place" in distinction from the "ravine" or "cleft," not as a mere adverb, see ver. 12.—Instead of אֶחָד some MSS. and EDD. have אַחַת, and Wellhausen remarks that the two numerals here seem to have changed places.—TR.]

overthrown [fall[13]] at the first, that whosoever heareth it will say, There is a
10 slaughter among the people that follow Absalom. And he also that is valiant,
whose heart is as the heart of a lion, shall utterly melt; for all Israel knoweth that
thy father is a mighty man, and they which be [that are] with him are valiant
11 men. Therefore [But] I counsel[14] that all Israel be generally gathered unto thee
from Dan even [*om.* even] to Beersheba, as the sand that is by the sea for multi-
12 tude, and that thou go to battle in thine own person. So shall we [And we shall]
come upon him in some place [in one of the places] where he shall be found, and
we will light upon him as the dew falleth on the ground,[15] and of him and of all
13 the men that are with him there shall not be left so much as one. Moreover
[And] if he be gotten into a city, then shall all Israel bring[16] ropes to that city, and
we will draw it into the river [brook], until there be not one small stone found
14 there. And Absalom and all the men of Israel said, The counsel of Hushai the
Archite [Arkite] is better than the counsel of Ahithophel. For the Lord had
appointed [And Jehovah appointed] to defeat the good counsel of Ahithophel, to
the intent that the Lord [Jehovah] might bring evil upon[17] Absalom.
15 Then said Hushai [And Hushai said] unto Zadok and to Abiathar the priests,
Thus and thus did Ahithophel counsel Absalom and the elders of Israel, and thus
16 and thus have I counselled. Now, therefore [And now], send quickly and tell
David, saying, Lodge not this night in the plains [at the fords[18]] of the wilderness,
but speedily [*om.* speedily] pass over, lest the king be swallowed up and all the
17 people that are with him. Now [And] Jonathan and Ahimaaz stayed by [were
stationed at] En-rogel, for they might not be seen to come into the city; and a
wench [the maid-servant] went and told them, and they went and told king David
[And Jonathan and Ahimaaz were stationed at En-rogel, and the maid-servant
came and told them, and they were to go and tell king David; for they might not
18 be seen, *etc.*[19]]. Nevertheless [And] a lad saw them and told Absalom; but
[and] they went both of them away [*om.* away] quickly, and came to a man's
house in Bahurim, which [and he] had a well in his court, whither [and thither]
19 they went down. And the woman took and spread a [the] covering over the well's
mouth, and spread ground corn thereon; and the thing was not known [nothing

[13] [Ver. 9. Or: "when he falls on them at the first" (so Erdmann and Sept.], and some would therefore supply the personal suffix וֹ to the Infinitive; but the present text permits either rendering, and that of Eng. A. V. seems to agree better with the context.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 11. Sept.: "Thus I counsel," ὅτι οὕτως συμβουλεύων ἐγὼ συνεβούλευσα = כִּי כֹה יָעֹץ יָעַצְתִּי, preferred by Wellhausen, on the ground that the similar words might easily have fallen out. The fullness of the expression would also be in Hushai's manner.—Some MSS. read: "as the sand on the shore (שְׂפַת) of the sea," an expansion of the original.—Böttcher's objection to the last word in this verse, קְרָב, "battle," is that it elsewhere occurs only in poetry (Ps., Job, Eccles., Zech.), and he proposes בְּקִרְבָּם, "in their midst." This reading is strongly supported by the fact that all the versions have it (Chald.: "at the head of them all"), and is in itself more congruous with the general context; against it is Hushai's inclination to use pompous and unusual words.—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 12. "On the face of the ground" in some MSS. and EDD., a scribal expansion, as in the preceding verse.—Tr.]

[16] [Ver. 13. Vulg., Thenius, Philippson, Erdmann render: "all Israel shall lay ropes at (= about) that city," on the ground that pulling a city stone by stone into the brook by ropes was an unheard-of and impossible thing (Bp. Patrick also suggests the same difficulty). But Hushai seems purposely to put his proposal in the most recklessly exaggerated form, as an appeal to Absalom's vanity, and says expressly that the city will be drawn into the brook. This meaning will be gotten if we render the Hiphil (הִשִּׂיאוּ): "lay to, apply to," and the text shows a double Accusative. The Hiphil may also mean: "cause to bring." Wellhausen remarks that we should here expect הֵשִׂימוּ, which is, however, according to the above view, not necessary.—Tr.]

[17] [Ver. 14. Literally: "to," אֶל. All the versions and some MSS. and Edd. have עַל, "upon."—The Pisqa in this verse is wanting in some MSS.; its effect is merely partially to isolate and bring out in relief the succeeding solemn statement.—Tr.]

[18] [Ver. 16. Eng. A. V. again adopts the Qeri, which is found in many MSS. and EDD. (De Rossi) and in all the versions. Kethib is here preferred as in xv. 28, which see.—The "speedily" of Eng. A. V. is meant as translation of the Infinitive Absolute, but introduces too different a substantive idea from that of the verb (עָבַר); the sense is rather: "actually pass over." The rendering: "lest the king be swallowed up" (so Philippson, Wellhausen) seems to be the best; the phrase is discussed by Erdmann, who adopts the translation: "lest it (transit over the river) be swallowed up (= snatched away)."—Tr.]

[19] [Ver. 17. Eng. A. V. here inverts the order of the Heb., in order to avoid the contradiction of making the statement: "they might not be seen to enter the city," follow the statement that they "had gone to tell the king" (rendering the verb יֵלְכוּ as Aorist). Erdmann says that this last statement is anticipatory. But the Imperfect is here better taken in the future sense: "and they were to go and tell," which avoids the somewhat hard anticipation. Philippson renders not substantially differently: "the maid told them that they were to go," *etc.*—Tr.]

20 was perceived]. And when [*om.* when] Absalom's servants came to the woman to
the house, they [and] said, Where is Ahimaaz and Jonathan? And the woman
said unto them, They be [are] gone over the brook[20] of water. And when they
had [And they] sought and could [did] not find them, they [and] returned to
Jerusalem.
21 And it came to pass, after they were departed, that they came up out of the well,
and went and told king David, and said unto David, Arise and pass quickly over
22 the water, for thus hath Ahithophel counselled against you. Then [And] David
arose, and all the people that were with him, and they passed over Jordan; by the
morning-light there lacked not one of them that was not gone over Jordan.
23 And when [*om.* when] Ahithophel saw that his counsel was not followed [*ins.*
and] he saddled his ass, and arose and gat him home [and went] to his house, to
his city, and put his household in order, and hanged himself, and died, and was
buried in the sepulchre of his father.

[20] [Ver. 20. The word מִיכַל is as yet unexplained. Rashi says that its meaning can only be inferred from the context. Sept.: *μικρόν*, "little" (perhaps from similarity of sound); Chald. takes the phrase as meaning "the Jordan." Syriac renders: "hence," as if it were מִן־כֹּה or מִפֹּה; Arab. omits it; Vulg.: "having tasted a little water," after the Sept. J. D. Michaelis and Gesenius compare Arab. *makil*, "a dry pit," *mimkal*, "a pit containing water," but this does not agree with the form of the Heb. word. Others assume a root יכל (Fürst takes this stem to mean "contain," whence our word = "water-ditch"). Wellhausen would drop מיכל from the text, or supply some such word as דֶּרֶךְ: "the way of the water."—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Chap. xvi. 15–23. *Absalom in Jerusalem. He is greeted by Hushai. Ahithophel counsels an evil deed.*—Ver. 15. **And Absalom**, comp. xv. 12, to which this narration attaches itself, the account of David's flight (xv. 13—xvi. 14) being interposed.—**And all the people of the men of Israel** [literally: all the people, the men of Israel.—Tr.]. Thenius: "Very significant: The old malcontents (ii. 8, 9)."—Ver. 16. **Hushai**, comp. xv. 32. He was to be the instrument for bringing to naught the designs of Ahithophel (xv. 31).—Ver. 17. That David's trusted friend and counsellor should come to him with the greeting: "may the king live," must have astonished Absalom. But instead of expressing this feeling, he answers (in his double question) with a scornful fling (as his nature was) at Hushai's friendly relation to David. [Patrick: Absalom did not reflect that one might have said to him: "Is this thy duty to thy father?"—Tr.].—Ver. 18 sqq. Hushai in his answer assumes the role of crafty dissimulation, suggested by David (xv. 34). His first word is the answer to Absalom's question: "why wentest thou not with thy friend?" It is therefore not to be rendered: "Nay, but" (De Wette, [Eng. A. V.]), but: "*Not* (*i. e.*, I went not with David), *because, etc.*" Vulg.: *nequaquam quia.* [The rendering of Eng. A. V. here seems more natural and appropriate. See "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]. **Whom the Lord has chosen**, that is, as the event has shown: I follow him who is king by God's choice. **As I served before thy father** [so will I be before thee, ver. 19], *i. e.*, it is self-evident that, my service with the father having ceased by God's will, I must attach myself to the son. By the clever use of this double argument, the *divine* and the *human*, he easily imposes on the inconsiderate Absalom the delusion that he means honestly. [Hushai's two reasons: 1) the voice of the people is the voice of God (Patrick); 2) former fidelity to the father is ground and pledge of present fidelity to the son.—Tr.].—Ver. 20. Brief statement of a council held by Absalom with Ahithophel and other counsellors (so the plural: "Give ye") on the means of announcing and securing his usurpation. The *Dativus commodi* (לָכֶם) gives the sense: "it is your affair to counsel me" [literally: "give ye you counsel," Eng. A.V. wrongly: "among you."—Tr.].—Ver. 21. Ahithophel's counsel was that he should publicly take to himself his father's concubines (xv. 16); this would indicate definite dethronement of the father, and complete assumption of royal authority. Comp. iii. 7; xii. 8. **All Israel will hear**, *etc.*—Ahithophel's purpose is, 1) to make the breach between Absalom and his father irreparable, and 2) to infuse energy into Absalom's followers, and confirm their defection from David.—Cornelius a Lapide: "That they may know that thy hatred against thy father is implacable, and so all hope and fear of reconciliation may be cut off, and they strengthened in thy conspiracy." So also Ahithophel hoped to secure his own position [*i. e.*, he feared that if a reconciliation were effected, he would be sacrificed.—Tr.]. Absalom's deed was the grossest insult to his father (comp. Gen. xlix. 4), and made reconciliation impossible. [Here again Ahithophel was perhaps avenging the wrong done to Bathsheba. So Blunt.—Tr.].—Ver. 22. They spread **the tent**; the Article [so the original, but it may properly be omitted in an English translation, because the definiteness is not obvious—Tr.] indicates that it was the tent designed for the roof, used by the king and his family for protection against sun, wind and rain. Thenius: "the expression: *the tent* is an evidence that the author is relating events of *his time*." **On the roof**, the same where David's look at Bathsheba led him into the path of sin, whose evil results for him are completed in this deed of Absalom. Thus is Nathan's threat (xii. 11) fulfilled;

as he sinned against Uriah's house, so is he punished in his own house.—Ver. 23. Explanatory remark attached to ver. 22. The immediate execution of Ahithophel's counsel is explained by the fact that it had almost the weight of a divine oracle with both David and Absalom. It is thus intimated that they both put too much confidence in this bad man, the bitter fruit whereof David is now reaping. In 1 Chron. xxvii. 33 he is expressly called the king's counsellor.* **To inquire of God's word** = to inquire of God. Comp. Judg. i. 1; xviii. 5; xx. 18, 23, 27; 1 Sam. x. 22; xiv. 37; xxii. 10, 13; xxiii. 2 [comp. Gen. xxv. 22, where, however, the verb is different.—Tr.]

Chap. xvii. 1–23. *Defeat of Ahithophel's counsel through Hushai's, and suicide of Ahithophel.*

Vers. 1–4. *Ahithophel's counsel against David:* To surprise him by night and kill him. Against the opinion of the older expositors that Ahithophel wished to avenge the wrongs of his granddaughter Bathsheba, is 1) that this relationship is not proved, for, though Ahithophel had a son named Eliam (xxiii. 34), it is not shown that this man is the same with Eliam, the father of Bathsheba (xi. 3); 2) granting, however, that Ahithophel was Bathsheba's grandfather, it is hard to see how an ambitious man, like him, should have sought revenge, when he saw his granddaughter raised to the highest honors of the realm. —His advice is to fall on David *quickly*, that same night, with a chosen body of 12,000 men, and get possession of his person. Absalom having publicly and solemnly mounted the throne, there was needed a securing of his usurped power against David and his followers. "*This* night" is the night that followed David's flight and Absalom's entrance into Jerusalem. In favor of this is ver. 16, and also ver. 2 compared with xvi. 14; for David's exhaustion, on which Ahithophel counted, could only come from the haste and exertion of the day's flight. The sudden night-attack with superior force (the march required was only about four geographical miles) was to throw David's followers into panic and flight, and, while they were thus scattered, Ahithophel was to kill the king "alone," that is, while he was alone (לְבַדּוֹ). He reckons on the king's weariness; in the phrase "weakhanded" the "hand" is the symbol of strength, comp. Isa. viii. 11.—Ver. 3. **And I will bring back all the people to thee**, that is, all the people now gathered around David. Ahithophel regards Absalom's government as the only lawful one, to which those fugitives must submit; their flight is in his eyes an act of insubordination, from which they are to be *brought back*.—In the following difficult phrase [Eng. A. V. and Erdmann: "the man thou seekest is as if all returned"] the first question is whether we shall (with Thenius) adopt the reading of the Septuagint: *as the bride returns to her husband; only the life of one man thou seekest*, (and all the people will be uninjured"). But, apart from the fact that no other ancient version has a trace of such a text, why may not the translation of the Sept. come (as Keil supposes) from a wrong reading of our Hebrew?* For the rest, Böttcher (against Thenius) rightly objects that we cannot speak of the "*husband*" of a bride; "where and when," he asks, further, "was the bride *brought back* to her husband?" Böttcher himself renders: "as her *wooer* leads *back* the bride, *etc.*" [where "wooer" is the person sent to propose for the bride, as Eliezer for Rebecca, Gen. xxiv.—Tr.]; against which is the fact that the word he proposes (אִישׁ) is never found in this sense of "wooer," and also the unsuitableness of the adverb "back." The rendering: "if all return, [only] the man that thou seekest [will be killed]" (Mich., Schultz) is to be rejected on account of the aposiopesis and consequent supplements. S. Schmid and Clericus translate: "when all the men that thou seekest return, all the people will be at peace" [so Philippson and Luther]; but this contradicts the connection, according to which the word "seekest" can only refer to David, and the word "man" (אִישׁ) must be in the Singular referring to him. Maurer proposes two renderings, one: "then I will bring back to thee all the people, as if the man that thou seekest *brought back* all," where the understanding of the Qal (שׁוּב) as causative, though possible (Num. x. 36; Ps. lxxxv. 5 [4]; Mic. ii. 18), is here improbable, as he says, since two forms [Qal and Hiphil] having the same meaning would not stand so near together; the other: "then I will bring back to thee all the people, *as if all returned*, would *the man* return (כְּשׁוּב) *whom thou seekest*" (*i. e.*, as if David, the man that thou seekest should be brought back with all his men) is to be rejected, (with Thenius) as *unintelligible*. The translation of the Vulgate: "and I will bring back all the people, as one man is accustomed to return (for one man thou seekest") gives no clear sense. Ahithophel's words are to be taken strictly according to their connection with the preceding ver. 2, where he sets the *one* man, David over against *all the people* with him, and announces it as his plan to kill him *alone*, so as then to bring back *all the people* (ver. 3) that had gone out with him. That is, the *one* man that thou seekest is equivalent to the return of the whole people. Peter Martyr (Vermigli): "one, says he, will perish, the multitude will be spared." Dathe: "it is the same as if all returned, when he that thou seekest is killed" [so nearly Chald.]. De Wette: "the man that thou seekest is equivalent to the return of all." Bunsen: "the return of all that have not yet joined thee, depends on the removal of David; his fall brings peace to the whole

* "And the counsel of Ahithophel . . . days"—the construction is interrupted, and completes itself in the כַּאֲשֶׁר . . . כֵּן. Qeri and all versions supply אִישׁ after יִשְׁאַל; but, if one is not disposed to accept this as necessary (Keil), the verb may be taken impersonally.

* הַכַּלָּה אִישׁ for הַכֹּל הָאִישׁ [with interpolation of "only the life of one man" (Keil). The Sept. text was: כְּשׁוּב הַכַּלָּה לְאִישָׁהּ אַךְ נֶפֶשׁ אִישׁ אֶחָד אַתָּה מְבַקֵּשׁ. It is suggested that the three words following הַכַּלָּה may have fallen out, because the eye of the scribe passed to the following אִישׁ, to which the ה in כלה was then prefixed, and the אחד made into אשר. This is possible, but the *sense* of the Sept. rendering is doubtful.—Tr.]

nation."—Literally: "the whole people will be *peace*," = "in peace," adverbial use, as in xx. 9; 1 Sam. xxv. 6.—Ver. 4. "The saying was right in the eyes of Absalom, *etc.*," pleased him (xix. 6; xviii. 20, 26; 1 Kings ix. 12; Jerem. xviii. 4, *etc.*).

Vers. 5–14. *Hushai's counsel against Ahithophel.*—Ver. 5. Though Ahithophel's counsel had been generally approved, Absalom sends for Hushai in order to hear his opinion. There is no need to read the Plural "call ye" (Sept., Vulg., Syr., Then.) instead of the Sing. "call thou" (of the Heb.), since Absalom, as king, might give such a command even to Ahithophel, instead of to the *servants*. As he had accorded full confidence to *Hushai* (xvi. 18, 19), he wished at this decisive moment to hear *his* advice also.*—Vers. 6, 7. Hushai, being asked, pronounces Ahithophel's counsel "not good" ["Not good is the counsel that Ahithophel counsels this time," that is, his former advice was good (xvi. 21), but not this.—Tr.].—Ver. 8 sq. Hushai gives his advice in elaborate and skilful style. Against Ahithophel's opinion that David was "exhausted" (ver. 2), he first affirms the contrary, observing that Absalom knew his father and his men to be valiant heroes, and that they were *embittered in spirit, as a bear robbed of her whelps* (comp. Judg. xviii. 25; Prov. xvii. 12; Hos. xiii. 8). So he would not stay at night with the people, where he might be surprised. Böttcher and Thenius render: "and lets not the people lodge for the night" (יָלִין as unusual Hiphil); but there is no ground for this, [it does not agree with ver. 9 (Keil)].—Ver. 9 sqq. Description of how David, as a genuine military man, would be on his guard during the night, and, at the approach of Absalom's troops, would rush forth from his caverns† and strong positions, fall on the enemy's advanced guard and defeat the whole body. "In the falling on them," where from the connection David is the subject,="when he falls on them." [Eng. A. V.: "in the falling among them," = when some of them fall. See "Text. and Gramm."—Tr.]. The "them" refers from the context to Absalom's men, and it is unnecessary to read "the people" (בָּעָם Dathe). "In the beginning," since David would begin the fight by falling on the approaching enemy. [Or, according to Eng. A. V., the fall of some of Absalom's soldiers at the beginning of the battle would create a panic and flight, there being general fear of the military skill and prowess of David and his generals. *Bib.-Com.*: "It is likely that Absalom was not a man of courage, and Hushai, knowing this, adroitly magnified the terror of the prowess of David and his men."—Tr.].—**And the hearer hears and says,** *etc.*—picture of the spread of a report of defeat by those that are first attacked.—Ver. 10. Though the hearer be lion-hearted, he will melt in fear, because it is known in all Israel what heroes David and his men are. This explains how the report of an attack by David would lead to a general everthrow.

To Ahithophel's proposal to surprise David Hushai replies that on the contrary David would surprise them.—Ver. 11. Therefore his counsel is that Absalom should summon a great force from all Israel, and lead it against David in person. Properly: "*but** (or, *rather*) I counsel." It is unnecessary to read "in their midst" (Sept., Vulgate, Arab., Thenius) instead of "into battle," since a change in the Hebrew from the latter to the former would be easy.—Ver. 12 sq. Hushai explains to Absalom how he could with so great an army easily annihilate David's band. "We shall come unto him in one† of the places." The next sentence is rendered in two ways: either: "so *we* on him," that is, so we fall on him (Vulg.: *irruemus super eum*), spread over him, as the dew falls on the earth;‡ or, "we light§ on him" [so Eng. A. V.], as the phrase is used of an encamping army (Isa. vii. 2, 19), and of a lighting swarm of flies or locusts (Isa. vii. 19; Ex. x. 14), and elsewhere (with עַל "on") in the sense of "lighting" (xxi. 10; Gen. viii. 4; Ex. x. 14; Nu. xi. 25, 26); not: "we encamp against him" (De Wette). The second translation ["we light on him"] answers better to the figure of the *dew*, which falls quietly and unperceived on the earth at night, with which (as before with the *sand* on the sea) Hushai compares Absalom's army, settling quietly in its overwhelming power on David. On the other hand the emphatic "we" at the beginning of the sentence [as in the first translation] is without ground, and does not correspond to the verb "we come" in the preceding clause; while to this latter properly corresponds the *verb* "we light" (as indeed all the ancient versions have a verb in this place). Böttcher further remarks that this form of the Heb. Pers. Pron. is everywhere else used in a depreciatory sense: "we *insignificant, very poor* persons," which would here be against the connection. Böttcher, however, would read "locust"‖ instead of "dew," and render: "and sink (rush) on him, as a swarm of locusts falls on the earth;" but this is too remote a conjecture (having no support in any ancient version or in any rendering), and unnecessary besides, since the figure of the *dew*, together with that of the *sand*, fitly sets forth the swift and quiet settling of the huge host on the enemy. And with this accords perfectly the statement of the success of the attack: "not even one will be left."—Ver. 13. Hushai, assuming that the imagination of his hearers would be carried from one conception to the other, here passes in a wordy discourse, skilfully adapted to gain his end, to the supposition (which would appear natural to a military man)

---

* The גַּם־הוּא strengthens the suffix in פִּיו. Ewald, § 311 *a*.

† פְּחָתִים, natural hiding-places, מְקוֹמוֹת, artificially strong positions; in these David would pass the night.

* So כִּי after a negation, expressed or understood, Ges. § 155, 1, *e*—פָּנֶיךָ = "thy person, thyself," the Plu. noun here accompanied by a Plu. Particip.—Instead of בַּקְּרָב Thenius would read בְּקִרְבָּם.

† The fem. numeral (though the subst. is found as fem. in Gen. xviii. 24; Job xx. 9) is probably (since the masc. is used in ver. 9) to be regarded as scribal error for masc. (Maurer).

‡ Taking נַחְנוּ = "we," as in Gen. xlii. 11; Ex. xvi. 7, 8; Num. xxxii. 32; Lam. iii. 42.

§ נַחְנוּ as 1 plu. Perf. Qal of נוּחַ, Sept. (παρεμβαλοῦμεν), Syr., Arab.

‖ חָסִיל or חָסֹל for הַטַּל.

that David, defeated as above described, should "concentrate to the rear," and throw himself into a strong city. **Then all Israel set ropes to this city.** Vulgate: "all Israel put ropes around that city." Hushai is not speaking of ropes thrown over the walls by which the latter are thrown into the ditch (Michaelis, Dathe, Niemeyer), for nothing is said of a *ditch* and *walls;* but in his exaggerated mode of expression, which he forces to a hyperbolical climax (all intended for momentary effect), he shows how easily even then David could be captured, all Israel laying ropes about the city and dragging it into the neighboring brook or river. We are not here with Ewald to understand a city-fosse (נַחַל), "for the fosse was *close* by the city" (Then.), but the brook or river on which the city is built, "because fortified cities are almost always on the declivities of brooks or rivers" (Then.). "Till not even a *small stone* be found," so the ancient versions;* comp. Am. ix. 9: "a little grain."—The meaning is: "Your powerful army will easily destroy the fortified place, where David may seek refuge, and leave not one stone on another." Cornelius a Lapide: "we will collect so great a force that we shall be able to put ropes around the city (so to speak), and drag it down to ruin."—Ver. 14. To this advice of Hushai Absalom gives the preference over Ahithophel's. The boldness and highflown extravagance of Hushai's words accorded with Absalom's character and with his wish to secure his throne in brilliant fashion by overpowering the force opposed to him. Clericus: "The counsel seemed good, and at the same time was full of a certain boastfulness, that pleased the young man." The statement about the bravery of David and his men was true; the deceit in Hushai's counsel was only the advice to make a levy of all Israel. Absalom deluded himself with the belief that this could be easily raised, not considering that only the discontented part of the people formed the kernel of the insurrection, that no small portion still remained true to David, and that another part, now for the moment fallen away, would return after the first fit of revolution had passed. For this reason it was an important consideration (to which Hushai slyly had regard) that David gained time while Absalom was preparing to summon all Israel. P. Martyr: "to what does Hushai look in this counsel? to delay; delay, he knows, makes for David's cause."—**And the Lord had appointed.** In all this the narrator sees a divine *appointment* or *ordination*, the aim of which was thus *to bring on Absalom the evil* (that was determined on). The verb (צִוָּה) is used in the signification "appoint, ordain," also in Ps. lxviii. 29 [28]; cxi. 9; Lam. i. 17; Isa. xlv. 12; the object of the verb is apparent from the connection. Ahithophel's counsel is called *good,* because it was to Absalom's interest to attack David immediately.

Vers. 15–22. *Hushai promptly sends word to David.*—Ver. 15. He first informs the two high-priests, Zadok and Abiathar, of the council that was held. Comp. xv. 27, 28. [*Bib. Com.:* "It is remarkable how persistently Zadok is named first."—Patrick: "Herein Hushai betrayed Absalom's counsels."—Tr.]—Ver. 16. He directs them to send information to David as speedily as possible by their sons, and to convey his advice concerning his next movement. Grotius: "David's plan, above mentioned (xv. 35, 36), succeeded well." **Lodge not to-night at the fords of the wilderness** (xv. 28), that is, stay not this side the Jordan, **but cross over.** The necessity of the passage of the Jordan for David's safety is shown by the following (variously understood) words: **That it** (namely, the transit) **be not swallowed up** (defeated, rendered impossible) **to the king and to all the people that are with him.** So (with Böttcher) the sentence is best understood from the connection and from David's dangerous situation, the noun "crossing over" [transit] being taken as the subject of the verb (עָבוֹר immediately preceding). It was important that David should get away from this side the Jordan, where the masses were to be called out against him, and meantime, since a hasty expedition might be sent against him, when it was found that he was on the west side (especially if Absalom should change his mind and adopt Ahithophel's counsel), he must pass immediately to the east side, where he might hope to find many followers, as actually happened. To the phrase "that it be not swallowed up" other interpretations are given: that of Maurer and De Wette: "lest destruction be prepared for the king" is untenable because the meaning of the verb ("swallowed up") makes the introduction of such a verbal subject ["destruction"] impossible; that of Gesenius: "that the king be not swallowed up" [so Eng. A. V.] is equally untenable, because then the text should have "the king" as Nominative [in the Heb. it is preceded by the Prep. "to"—Tr.]. Of Ewald's rendering (Gram. 295 *c*): "that it (misfortune) be not swallowed by the king," that is, that the king may not have to suffer it, Böttcher rightly says: "a *very* unnatural rendering, with a *very* remote verbal subject, for which the verb would at least better be Feminine." [It seems allowable here to take the verb as impersonal, and render (with Eng. A. V., Ges., Philippson, Cahen): "lest it be swallowed (destroyed) to the king," *i. e.,* lest the king be destroyed. So all the ancient versions* understood it. The construction adopted by Erdmann requires a somewhat difficult supply of a subject to the verb.—Tr.]—Ver. 17. "And Jonathan and Ahimaaz were standing" [= were stationed], where the Participle "were standing" expresses their readiness to go as messengers to David at any moment, according to the arrangement in xv. 28, 36. To this end they were stationed outside the city at the *Fuller's Fountain* [En-rogel] for the purpose of receiving information. *En-rogel* (comp. Josh. xv. 7; 1 Kings i. 9) is the "present very deep and abundant Fountain of Job, Bir Eyub (Von Raumer, p. 307), or of Nehemiah, south of Jerusalem where the vallies

* צְרוֹר — צוֹר.—On the masc. אֹתוֹ referring to the fem. עִיר see Ew. § 174, 6 *a*.

* [Sept. (Alex.): "lest one swallow up the king;" Vulg.: "lest the king be swallowed up;" Syr.: "lest thou perish;" Chald.: "lest profit be gotten from the king," *i. e.,* lest he be betrayed (Walton's Polyg. incorrectly: "lest the king perish").—Tr.]

of Kidron and Hinnom meet, Rob. II. 138 sqq. [Am. ed. I. 331-333]; Tobler, Top. II. 50 sqq." (Knobel). [See in Smith's Bible-Dictionary, Art. "En-rogel," Bonar's argument for identifying En-rogel with the "Fountain of the Virgin," and Dr. Wolcott's reply (Am. ed.) in favor of Bir Eyub.—Tr.]—**The maid,** not "*a* maid," since the Article [of the Heb.] denotes the particular maid-servant belonging to the high-priest's house. **And they went,** an anticipatory remark, the narrator desiring to mention immediately the chief fact, namely, that they carried the information to David. [See "Text. and Gram.," where the inversion of Eng. A. V. is pointed out, and a slightly different translation proposed.—Tr.] **For they could not let themselves be seen to come into the city**—appended explanation of the fact that they were outside the city, and the maid-servant had to go to them. Her going out to the spring would not seem strange, while their entrance and return would have excited suspicion, since it was known (xv. 25 sqq.) that they were on David's side.—From ver. 18 it seems that Absalom closely watched them: **A lad saw them and told Absalom.** Seeing that they were observed, and expecting to be followed, they hastened off in order to get the start of their pursuers, and then to hide somewhere. They went to *Bahurim*, where Shimei met David (xvi. 5), whose counterpart is the man in whose house the two young men found refuge. It is again a woman (the man's wife) whose presence of mind and cunning did David's cause a great service. The messengers descended into the empty well in the court.—Ver. 19. **And she spread the covering,** which (as the Art. shows) was at hand, or was designed for the well (Thenius), **over the well, and spread thereon the grain-corns** (Prov. xxvii. 22) with which (so the Art. indicates) she was occupied. Vulg. (explanatory rendering): "as if she were drying barley-groats." —Ver. 20. Absalom's servants come in pursuit, are misdirected by the woman, find nothing and return to Jerusalem.* [Patrick: "It seems to have been a common opinion in those days that these officious lies for the safety of innocent persons had no hurt in them."—Tr.]—Ver. 21 sq. The messengers hastened to David, who, in consequence of the information they brought, crossed the river immediately, so that by the morning light *not even a man more* was on the west side. The situation of affairs was now favorable to David's cause.

Ver. 23. Ahithophel betakes himself to his city, leaves Absalom's court, that is, out of chagrin at the rejection of his counsel, anger at the frustration of his ambitious plans, and also from fear of the fatal results that David's victory would have for him, the contriver and furtherer of the insurrection. A self-murder† from baffled ambition and despair. Not only is David's prayer (xv. 31) answered, but Ahithophel falls under God's judgment for his unfaithfulness and treachery.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. Absalom's insurrection and the establishment of a new kingdom with public dishonoring of the royal house, is the completion of the judgment on David's deep fall and weakness towards his sons' crimes, the purpose of which was to purify him (after penitential self-humiliation on his part), and to subject him to the test of faith, without which he could not rise by God's hand from this deep abasement. On the other hand, the success of the godless rebel shows a lack of a true theocratic feeling in the mass of the people, who, in abandoning God's government, were guilty of opposition to the government of God. At the same time in Absalom's conduct (adopted through Ahithophel's evil counsel) is exhibited the general truth that God permits *evil* to work out its own consequences, and *the wicked* to entangle themselves in their own snares, that He may reveal His justice and holiness in the self-condemnation and self-destruction of the power of evil, and thus lead the wandering and apostate, when they will hear His voice, to reflection and conversion, as happened here to the people, after the wickedness of Absalom and Ahithophel had completely worked itself out.

2. The divine justice is anew revealed in and on the house of David through Absalom's publicly committed crime. The answer to the question why God brought on David's house this deed of shame of His own son, is given in the Lord's word through Nathan (xii. 11, 12). The sins of the fathers are visited not only *on* the children, but *through* them. "Absalom's deed was another chastisement for David from the Lord, not, indeed, a sign of the divine anger, but a wholesome paternal discipline, that was meant for his good. In such earnest does God deal with His children, even after He has taken them into favor" (Schlier).

3. Absalom's rejection of Ahithophel's good counsel for Hushai's destructive counsel sets forth the truth that evil punishes itself by itself, and especially pride and vanity blind man, so that he errs in the choice of means for his sinful ends, and secures not only their frustration, but also his own destruction. But this occurs in the course of the moral government of the world, under the guidance of the divine justice and wisdom, which takes human sin, blindness and foolishness into its plans as a factor, in order to frustrate its wicked aims and to effect its own holy aims.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Chap. xvi. 15. Schlier: Poor, deluded fool, that strives after popular favor, and when he has found it, consoles himself therewith. There is nothing more changeable than popular favor—nothing more transitory than what is called public opinion.—Vers. 16–19. Cramer: Remain faithful to thy friend in his poverty, that thou mayest again enjoy thyself with him when it goes well with him (Ecclus. xxii. 28, 29).—The saints of God do many a thing with good intentions, and yet we are not on that account to take part in it

* מִיכַל הַמָּיִם a ἅπ. λεγ.—a small brook in the vicinity. [See "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

† [There is an old opinion (see Patrick *in loco*) that Ahithophel died of quinsy brought on by violent passions, grief, chagrin, hatred, and Then. (Comm. *in loco*) mentions that the same view (as to the disease) is maintained by Steuber (1741). In Dryden's "Absalom and Ahithophel" the latter personage represents the Earl of Shaftesbury.—Tr.]

all. Meantime God lets it happen, and knows how thereby to carry out His work (Isa. xxviii. 21, 29).—SCHLIER: What we say should be true, not merely that it shall contain no lie, but also that it be free from all double meaning. In the times of the Old Testament, God the Lord could overlook such double-meaning; with us, in the times of the New Testament, that is no longer the case, but it holds always and every where that the Lord will make the upright prosper.—Ver. 20 sq. HEDINGER: Worldly wisdom and spiritual gifts do not always dwell under one roof.—S. SCHMID: He must be extremely ungodly who can openly do that of which nature has a horror even in private.—SCHLIER: David certainly thought anew upon his old sins, was ashamed and humbled himself, and in his son's sin again recognized his own sin, and anew repented before the Lord.

Chap. xvii. 1–4. CRAMER: God blinds the ungodly, and confounds them through giddiness, so that they can neither see nor know what in human wise is wholesome and good for them; for He puts to shame the wisdom of the wise (Isa. xxix. 14; Job xii. 17).—[TAYLOR: This plan was worthy of Ahithophel's reputation. If it had been energetically followed, it would have been completely successful, and would have changed the entire color and complexion of Jewish history.—TR.]

Vers. 5–14. Large talking and grand schemes are a means whereby young and inexperienced persons are often deceived (1 Kings xii. 10).—The Lord ensnares the ungodly in their cunning, so that they are deceived by that very thing on which they most relied.—S. SCHMID: If God does not open and rule the eyes of the mind, even the most sensible men are blind (Psalm cxix. 18).—STARKE: God does not leave His enemies to manage as they will, but appoints them a limit, how far they shall go. When they take hold most shrewdly, yet God goes another road (Ps. xxxiii. 10; Isa. viii. 10; Job v. 12).—[HALL: First, to sweeten his opposition, Hushai yields the praise of wisdom to his adversary in all other counsels, that he may have leave to deny it in this; his very contradiction in the present insinuates a general allowance. Then he suggests certain apparent truths concerning David's valor and skill to give countenance to the inferences of his improbabilities. Lastly, he cunningly feeds the proud humor of Absalom, in magnifying the power and extent of his commands, and ends in the glorious boasts of his fore-promised victory. As it is with faces, so with counsel; that is fair that pleaseth. —TR.]—SCHLIER: A good cause always goes the way of truth, and does not need scoffing and self-important words, but goes on soberly and simply. Absalom gave heed to Hushai's bad counsel, because Hushai knew how by means of his vanity to bring him to a fall.—The Lord is with us and lets nothing happen to us; He also knows how to turn the wickedness of our enemies into a blessing to us. And if all the world is hostile and persecutes us, the Lord takes in hand even our persecutors, and does with them as He pleases.

Vers. 15–22. SCHLIER: Let us recognize the Lord's hand in the things of common life also, but let us always honor His hand and thankfully accept what it gives. Circumstances are God's messengers, and well for him who in these circumstances recognizes and honors the hand of his Lord. It was God's hand that through all these littlenesses and casualties caused the news of Ahithophel's counsel to come safe to David.

Ver. 23. CRAMER: Ungodly men fall into the pit which they make for others (Psa. vii. 16 [15]; ix. 16 [15]; Prov. xxvi. 27). [HALL: What a mixture do we find here of wisdom and madness! Ahithophel will needs hang himself; there is madness: he will yet set his house in order; there is an act of wisdom. ..... How preposterous are the cares of idle worldlings, that prefer all other things to themselves, and while they look at what they have in their coffers, forget what they have in their breasts.—TAYLOR: This is the first recorded case of deliberate suicide. And the feelings which led to it, and which we can easily analyze, were very similar to those which have impelled many in our own times to commit the same awful iniquity. Chief among them was wounded pride. Then, besides this, there was the conviction that Absalom's cause was now hopelessly ruined .... Perhaps also there was a mingling of remorse with those other emotions of pride. He had left a master who loved and valued him, and had transferred his services to one who, as he now discovered, had not the wisdom to appreciate his worth, but preferred the gaudy glitter of empty rhetoric to the substantial wisdom of unadorned speech. This contrast, thus forced upon him, might awaken his conscience to the value of the friendship which he had forfeited when he turned against David, until remorse and shame overwhelmed him.—TR.]

[Chap. xvii. 5. It was not unwise in Absalom to seek the advice of another experienced counsellor also (Prov. xxiv. 6); his fault was that he did not know which advice to follow, and was misled by high-sounding and flattering words. In choosing counsellors, and in judging of their counsel, lies great part of the wisdom of life.—Boldness is often true prudence; and "delays are dangerous."—Ver. 14. Hushai's treacherous craft and Absalom's silly vanity are overruled to the accomplishment of the Lord's purpose. Few things are so consoling as the frequency with which we perceive how God brings good out of evil; and doubtless this is often true where we do not yet perceive it (Ps. lxxvi. 10; Is. xiii. 7).—Ver. 23. *Ahithophel* 1) A model of worldly wisdom (xvi. 23). Excellence of his advice to Absalom (xvi. 21; xvii. 1–3). 2) An example of worldly wisdom failing because it ignores God (ver. 14; Ps. xiv. 1). 3) A suicide; *a*) probable causes; *b*) folly and guilt.—TR.]

3. The Civil War.

Chapters XVII. 24 – XVIII. 33 [XIX. 1].

a. David at Mahanaim. Chap. XVII. 24–29.

24 Then [And] David came to Mahanaim. And Absalom passed over Jordan,
25 he and all the men of Israel with him. And Absalom made Amasa captain of the
host instead of Joab, which [and] Amasa was a man's son,[1] whose name was Ithra,
an Israelite [the Ishmaelite], that went in to Abigail the daughter of Nahash, sis-
26 ter to Zeruiah, Joab's mother. So [And] Israel and Absalom pitched in the land
27 of Gilead. And it came to pass, when David was come to Mahanaim, that Shobi
the son of Nahash of Rabbah of the children of Ammon, and Machir the son of
28 Ammiel of Lo-debar, and Barzillai the Gileadite of Rogelim, Brought[2] beds, and
basons, and earthen vessels, and wheat, and barley, and flour, and parched *corn*,
29 and beans, and lentiles, and parched *pulse* [*corn*], And honey, and butter [curds],
and sheep, and cheese of kine, for David, and for the people that were with him, to
eat; for they said, The people *is* [*got*[3]] hungry, and weary, and thirsty in the wil-
derness.

b. The battle in the forest of Ephraim. Chap. XVIII. 1–8.

1 And David numbered [mustered] the people that were with him, and set cap-
2 tains of thousands and captains of hundreds over them. And David sent forth
[gave[4]] a third part of the people under [into[4]] the hand of Joab, and a third part
under [into] the hand of Abishai the son of Zeruiah, Joab's brother, and a third
part under [into] the hand of Ittai the Gittite. And the king said unto the people,
3 I will surely [*om.* surely] go forth with you myself also. But [And] the people
answered [said], Thou shalt not go forth; for if we flee away, they will not care

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 25. Probably we should read: "the son of a stranger (foreigner)" (אִישׁ נָכְרִי, or אִישׁ גֵּר). Instead of "Israelite" editors now generally read: "Ishmaelite" (1 Chr. ii. 17). The old Jewish view is that Ithra or Jithra or Jether (another name for Jesse) was an Israelite by birth, but had lived long among the Ishmaelites, or was an Ishmaelite by birth and an Israelite by religion (a proselyte), and that the phrase "son of a man" = "a man of distinction" (so Philippson); but this is less probable than that our text is corrupt. Wordsworth supposes that the name "Israelite" may be used in distinction from 'Judahite,' to show that Jithra did not belong to the tribe of Judah; but Cahen remarks that this designation (Israelite) seems not to have come into use till after the division of the kingdom.—Wellhausen thinks that "daughter of Nahash" is for "son of Nahash," and is an insertion from ver. 27, a not improbable supposition; the statement would then be: "Amasa was the son of a foreigner named Jethra the Ishmaelite, who went in unto Abigail, sister to Zeruiah, Joab's mother." Abigail and Zeruiah would then be full sisters to David, and Amasa illegitimate son of Abigail, and cousin of Joab.—The reading of Sept. and Vulg.: "Jezreelite" is less probable than the "Ishmaelite" of 1 Chr. ii. 17, because our text indicates (by the maimed phrase: "son of a man") that Jethra was a non-Israelite. The Arabic reading is noticeable: "and Absalom made his lance-bearer in place of Ahithophel, a man named Amsa, son of a rich man named Jether."—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 28. The verb does not occur in the Heb. till ver. 29, whence it is proposed to insert (with the versions) a verb or participle (מְבִיאִים) at the beginning of ver. 28. The verb in ver. 29 may be retained, and would, indeed, serve to govern the nouns in ver. 28, but for the phrase "for the people to eat," since the things mentioned in that verse are not all eatables. The difficulty, however, still exists if (with Erdmann) we supply the copula before the "brought" of ver. 29; we may then say that the word "eat" is used of the principal part of the things brought (in which case it will not be absolutely necessary to supply the verb at the beginning of ver. 28), or, we may suppose that the articles last mentioned (ver. 29, together with the קָלִי "parched corn" at end of verse 28, the repetition of which would thus be explained) were brought ready for *immediate* eating, the others (ver. 28) as a store of provisions.—The word "corn" is retained in its proper sense = "grain," though liable to be misunderstood by American readers for *maize*.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 29. The people were not at Mahanaim, and had gotten hungry during the march through the wilderness.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 2. The verb does not mean "sent forth," nor had the army yet begun its march (ver. 6); the phrase שׁלח ביד means either: "to send by the hand of some one," or: "to give over to some one," here the latter.—The adverb "surely" is too strong for the signification of the Infinitive Absolute.—Tr.]

for [pay attention to[5]] us; neither [and] if half of us die, will they care for us [they
will not pay attention to us]; but now *thou* [for thou[5]] art worth ten thousand of
4 us; therefore [and] now it is better that thou succour us out of the city. And the
king said unto them, What seemeth you best I will do. And the king stood by the
gate-side, and all the people came out [went forth] by hundreds and by thousands.
5 And the king commanded Joab and Abishai and Ittai, saying, Deal gently for my
sake with the young man, *even* with [*om.* even with] Absalom. And all the people
6 heard when the king gave all the captains charge concerning Absalom. So [And]
the people went out into the field against Israel; and the battle was [*or*, took place]
7 in the wood of Ephraim. Where [And] the people of Israel were slain [smitten
there] before the servants of David, and there was there[6] a great slaughter that day
8 of twenty thousand men. For [And] the battle was there scattered over the face
of all the country; and the wood devoured more people that day than the sword
devoured.

c. Absalom murdered by Joab. Vers. 9–18.

9 And Absalom met[7] the servants of David. And Absalom rode [was riding] upon
a [the] mule, and the mule went under the thick boughs of a [the] great oak [tere-
binth], and his head caught hold of the oak [terebinth], and he was taken up be-
tween the heaven and the earth, and the mule that was under him went away
10 [passed on]. And a certain man saw it, and told Joab, and said, Behold, I saw
Absalom hanged in an oak [the terebinth]. And Joab said unto the man that told
11 him, And behold, thou sawest *him*, and why didst thou not smite him there to the
ground? and I would have given thee ten *shekels* [*pieces*] of silver, and a girdle.
12 And the man said unto Joab, Though[8] I should receive a thousand *shekels* [*pieces*]
of silver in mine hand, *yet* would I not put forth my hand against the king's son;
for in our hearing the king charged thee and Abishai and Ittai, saying, Beware
13 that none touch the young man Absalom. Otherwise[9] I should have wrought false-
hood against mine own life; for there is no matter hid from the king, and thou thy-
14 self wouldest have set thyself against *me*. Then said Joab [And Joab said], I may

[5] [Ver. 3. Literally: "set heart on us."—אַתָּה "thou" instead of עַתָּה "now" is read by Sept., Vulg., Sym., and by one or two MSS.—Syr. has "now;" its text here (followed by Arab.) is badly maimed.—Instead of "out of the city" Sept., an anonymous Greek version and Vulg., have "in the city," which is perhaps merely an explanatory rendering. The absence of the Art. in מֵעִיר creates a difficulty. *Bib.-Com.*, taking מֵעִיר as Hiph. participle of עוּר, proposes to render: "that thou be to us a stirrer-up in helping us," *i. e.*, that thou help us by stirring us up. But the construction here does not favor this rendering; the verb (Hiphil) is followed by the Acc. of the person or thing roused, and frequently by עַל ("against") with the person against whom it is roused; the Infin. here also would from the construction rather have for its subject the roused than the rouser. It is better to supply the Art. מֵהָעִיר, or else to read בָּעִיר.—Kethib לַעְזִיר for לְהַעְזִיר Hiph. Infin.; Qeri לַעְזוֹר Qal.—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 7. Omitted by Sept. as unnecessary. The first "there" in this verse is retained in Sept. (not omitted, as Wellh. says).—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 9. Wellhausen: "from the connection with לִפְנֵי ['in the presence of'] and from ver. 10 it appears that the text וַיִּקָּרֵא is incorrect; read perhaps וַיִּרָא ['and Absalom feared']." But the construction is supported by Deut. xxii. 6 (*Bib.-Com.*), and the statement of ver. 10 is properly explained by this statement that Absalom in his flight "met," accidentally came across some of David's men.—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 12. Read the Qeri לוּ or לֹא (= לוּא).—"Though I should weigh (שֹׁקֵל) into (upon) my hand;" instead of the Act. Particip. Wellhausen reads the Pass. שָׁקוּל: "though there were weighed into my hand," but the man might easily conceive of the weighing as done by himself.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 13. Eng. A. V. here follows the Qeri ("my life," Kethib "his life"). The whole verse is difficult in text and meaning. The line of thought seems to favor the marginal reading בְּנַפְשׁוֹ "against his life; but it is then difficult to see whether the man presents two reasons for not killing Absalom: 1) his regard for the king's command (ver. 12), 2) his fear of the consequences to himself (ver. 13), or only the former. Moreover whether the last phrase in the verse is to be rendered "thou wilt have to stand before him" (to give account, or testimony), or "thou wilt stand (appear) against me" is uncertain; the latter is more probable. In the first part of our verse the Sept. had a different text from the Heb.: "guard me the young man Absalom, not to do wrong against his life," which would simplify the man's address. We may adopt the reading (מֵעֲשׂוֹת instead of אוֹ־עָשִׂיתִי), or keep the Heb. text and render: "or if I acted falsely against his life, then nothing is concealed from the king, and thou wouldest take stand against me."—Tr.]

not tarry thus with thee. And he took three darts[10] in his hand, and thrust them
through [into] the heart of Absalom, while he was yet alive in the midst of the
15 oak [terebinth]. And ten young men that bare Joab's armour compassed about
16 and smote Absalom, and slew him. And Joab blew the trumpet, and the people
17 returned from pursuing after Israel, for Joab held back[11] the people. And[12] they
took Absalom, and cast him into a [the] great pit in the wood, and laid a very great
18 heap of stones upon him; and all Israel fled, every one to his tent. Now [And]
Absalom in his lifetime had taken and reared up for himself a [the] pillar,[13] which
is in the king's dale; for he said, I have no son to keep my name in remembrance;
and he called the pillar after his own name, and it is called unto this day, Absalom's place [monument].

d. The tidings of joy and grief. David's lament over Absalom. Vers. 19–33 [XIX. 1].

19 Then said Ahimaaz, the son of Zadok [And Ahimaaz the son of Zadok said],
Let me now run, and bear the king tidings how [*om.* how] that the Lord [Jeho-
20 vah] hath avenged [delivered] him of [from] his enemies. And Joab said unto
him, Thou shalt not bear tidings this day, but thou shalt bear tidings another day;
21 but this day thou shalt bear no tidings, because[14] the king's son is dead. Then said
Joab to Cushi [And Joab said to the Cushite], Go, tell the king what thou hast
22 seen. And Cushi [the Cushite] bowed himself unto Joab and ran. Then said
Ahimaaz the son of Zadok [And Ahimaaz the son of Zadok said] yet again to Joab,
But, however, let me, I pray thee, also run after Cushi [the Cushite]. And Joab
said, Wherefore wilt thou run, my son, seeing that thou hast no tidings ready.[15]
23 But howsoever, *said he*,[16] let me run. And he said unto him, Run. Then [And]
Ahimaaz ran by the way of the plain, and overran Cushi [the Cushite].
24 And David sat [was sitting] between the two gates; and the watchman went up
to the roof over [of] the gate unto the wall, and lifted up his eyes, and looked
25 [saw], and behold a man running alone. And the watchman cried [called] and
told the king. And the king said, If he be alone, there is tidings in his mouth.

[10] [Ver. 14. The word (שֵׁבֶט) not "dart," but "staff," and is contrasted with the word "spear" (חֲנִית) in 2 Sam. xxiii. 21. Either, then, we must suppose Joab to have used an uncommon weapon (Erdmann) or we must change the text. Erdmann states the objections to Thenius' proposed reading שְׁלָחִים, and it would be hard to account for an alteration of חניתים or חםיתות into שבטים.—Instead of: "in the heart (בלב) of the terebinth" Thenius proposes to read after Syr. and Vulg.: "hung in (תָּלוּי) the terebinth," for which there seems no necessity; the renderings of these two versions are merely interpretations.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 16. Sept., Vulg., Thenius, Keil, Erdmann render: "Joab wished to spare the people," but the rendering of Eng. A. V. seems better because the idea of "wish" is not contained in the Hebrew, and the phrase "the people" in connection with Joab more naturally refers to David's army.—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 17. Wellhausen objects to the order of vers. 14–17, because it represents Absalom, already half-dead from hanging, as surviving Joab's stabbing with the staves or darts, and finally meeting his death from the young men. He would make the last word of ver. 15 and ver. 16 follow ver. 14, and then insert vers. 15, 17. so as to read: "14, Joab took three darts, *etc.*, . . . in the terebinth, and killed him, 16 and blew the trumpet, and held back the people. 15 and ten young men compassed about Absalom, 17 and took him, *etc.*" Though this is ingenious, it is not required by the text. Joab's wounds did not kill Absalom, and the zealous armor-bearers finished him; then Joab called in his soldiers, and they (indef. subject = Passive) took Absalom and cast him into the pit.—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 18. This word has the sign of determination (את), and yet is not followed by a determinative noun; whence Wellhausen would supply אֲשֵׁרָה (in place of following אשר), and render: "took the pillar of the Asherah [idol-image] in the king's dale and set it up." But (apart from the fact that אֲשֵׁרָה does not occur after a construct מַצֶּבֶת, in 1 Kings xiv. 23; xvii. 10 the two words are used co-ordinately) this is an example of a word determined by a relative clause, as in Gen. xl. 3. See Ew. § 277 *d*, 2), and Ges. § 116.—At the end of the verse יָד = "monument," a different word from that rendered "pillar."—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 20. Eng. A. V. here adopts the Qeri עַל־כֵּן: "for the king's son is dead." Syr. and Chald., omitting the כֵּן, render: "thou wilt not announce except that the king's son is dead," which, however, the present Heb. will not bear.—עַל־כֵּן usually means "therefore," but here = "because" (= כִּי עַל־כֵּן).—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 22. Eng. A. V. takes לְכָה = "to thee," and מֹצֵאת Qal. Act. Particip. fem. of מָצָא, = "finding, ready;" Erdmann renders the Particip. "reward-finding," Philippson: "profitable;" Wellhausen takes it as Hoph. of יָצָא (מֻצֵאת) = "brought out, paid out" (Gen. xxxviii. 25); *Bib.-Com.*: "sufficing," which commends itself as appropriate.—According to Böttcher, it is only when the pronoun is emphatic that we can render לְכָה "to thee;" and here it is better = "go thou" (= "and if thou go"). But the pronoun may be emphatic here.—Tr.]

[16] [Ver. 23. Insert וַיֹּאמֶר at the beginning of the verse.—Tr.]

26 And he came apace and drew near [he came nearer and nearer]. And the watch-
man saw another man running; and the watchman called unto the porter,[17] and
said, Behold, *another* [*om.* another, *ins.* a] man running alone. And the king said,
27 He also bringeth tidings. And the watchman said, Methinketh the running of
the foremost is like the running of Ahimaaz the son of Zadok. And the king said,
28 He is a good man, and cometh with good tidings. And Ahimaaz called, and said
unto the king, All is well [Peace!] And he fell down to the earth upon his face be-
fore the king, and said, Blessed be the Lord [Jehovah] thy God, which hath de-
29 livered up the men that lifted up their hand against my lord the king. And the
king said, Is the young man Absalom safe? And Ahimaaz answered [said] When
Joab sent the king's servant and *me* [*om.* the king's servant and me[18]] thy servant,
30 I saw a great tumult, but I knew not what *it was*. And the king said *unto him*
[*om.* unto him], Turn aside, *and* stand here. And he turned aside and stood still.
31 And behold, Cushi [the Cushite] came; and Cushi [the Cushite] said, Tidings, my
lord the king, for the Lord [Let my lord the king receive the tidings that Jehovah]
hath avenged [delivered] thee this day of [from] all them that rose up against
32 thee. And the king said unto Cushi [the Cushite], Is the young man Absalom
safe? And Cushi answered [the Cushite said], The enemies of my lord the king,
and all that rise against thee to do *thee* hurt [for evil] be as *that* [the] young man
33 *is* [*om.* is]. [Heb. xix. 1]. And the king was much moved, and went up to the
chamber over the gate, and wept; and as he went, thus he said, O my son Absalom,
my son, my son Absalom! would God [O that] I had died for thee, O Absalom,
my son, my son!

[17] [Ver. 26. Instead of שֹׁעֵר "porter" Erdmann, Then., Böttcher, Wellhausen (after Sept. and Syr.) read שַׁעַר "gate," which, however, is not necessary, and this statement is not in conflict with ver. 25, where the watchman seems to speak directly to the king.—After the second אִישׁ Thenius and Wellhausen (Sept., Vulg., Syr.) insert אַחֵר "another;" but Böttcher properly remarks that this would naturally be inserted by the versions (so Eng. A. V. inserts it) from the preceding part of the verse, while its omission could not so well be accounted for.—Tr.]

[18] [Ver. 29. Erdmann renders as Eng. A. V., but the construction, as it stands, is awkward and improbable. The simplest procedure seems to be that of Wellhausen, to omit אֶת־עֶבֶד הַמֶּלֶךְ (though it is not easy to account for its insertion). Some (so *Bib.-Com.*) prefer the Vulg. rendering, on which see Erdmann in the Exposition. Related questions, such as the person of "the Cushite," will there be referred to.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

a. Ch. xvii. 24–29. *David at Mahanaim.*

Ver. 24. **To Mahanaim**, east of the Jordan (which he had crossed in the night, passing through the Jordan-valley, ver. 22), probably a fortified place, north of the Jabbok, suitable for a rendezvous for gathering an army, whence it was chosen by Abner as Ishbosheth's capital-city. See on ii. 8. [A well-provisioned country, friendly to David (*Bib.-Com.*).—Tr.]—Absalom's *passage* over the Jordan took place when he had had time to gather (according to Hushai's counsel) "all the men of Israel," that is, all the military force of the country (comp. ver. 11 sq.). Ver. 25. Whether *Amasa*, appointed by Absalom captain in place of Joab (who remained faithful to David), is the same with the Amasai of 1 Chron. xii. 17, 18 (Ewald, Bertheau), must be left undetermined. "If this conjecture were correct, the man, so cordially received by David (1 Chron. xii. 17), would have committed grave wrong in attaching himself to Absalom" (Then.). Elsewhere the phrase "son of a man (or woman)" is defined by a following appositional word or genitive (Böttcher); but here the defining phrase is introduced by "and" ["and his name was Ithra"], so that we have the independent assertion: "son of a man," which is meaningless. Perhaps the text originally had: "whose name was" (אֲשֶׁר שְׁמוֹ), and the relative pronoun has fallen out (from the following אשר). Böttcher conjectures that "foreigner" (גֵּר) stood after "man," comp. i. 13 [it would then read: "Amasa was the son of a foreigner, and his name was Ithra."—Tr.].—With this would agree that *Ithra* was an *Ishmaelite*, for so we must here read instead of "Israelite," after 1 Chron. ii. 17, where *Jether* is shortened form of *Ithra* (Sept.: "the Jezreelite," Josh. xix. 18, so David's wife Ahinoam, 1 Sam. xxviii. 3). The designation of Ithra as an "Israelite" would be superfluous; but the statement that he was an "Ishmaelite" serves to illustrate the fact that Amasa was an illegitimate son of Abigail. If Nahash be taken as a man's name, and the word "sister" in apposition with Abigail, then Zeruiah and Abigail are daughters of David's mother by her first marriage with Nahash, step-daughters of Jesse, and on *this side* step-sisters of David (so the older expositors, Michaelis and Schultz). But Nahash may, with Movers and Thenius (who refers to 1 Chron. iv. 12, where it is the name of a *city*), be taken as a woman's name, here a *second* wife of Jesse. In this case also the two, Zeruiah and Abigail, would be David's step-sisters. Clericus supposes Nahash to be another name, or a sur-

name of Jesse; Capellus would read "Jesse" instead of "Nahash" (after a variant of the Sept.); Böttcher puts "sister" in apposition with "Nahash," which he regards as a woman's name. [It is an old Jewish view that Nahash is another name of Jesse. For many persons, says Kimchi, had two names, and this (Nahash) signifies "a serpent." From whence it is that when Isaiah (xiv. 29) saith: "out of the serpent's root (or, the root of Nahash) shall come forth a cockatrice or basilisk," the Chaldee paraphrase expounds it, "out of the root of Jesse shall come forth the Messiah;" who was typified by the brazen serpent in the wilderness (Patrick). This would be baseless allegorizing, even if Nahash were proved to be another name of Jesse, which is not probable. The omission of the name Nahash in 1 Chron. ii. 16 is against the view that it belongs to a daughter of Jesse; more probably it is the name of the otherwise unknown father of Abigail. See "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]—Ver. 26. Absalom pitched his camp in *Gilead*. Nothing is said of a *siege* (Ewald) of Mahanaim. Against this view is the fact that David, as appears from what follows, here got supplies of men and provisions, formed an army, and organized it in three divisions, which required time. It is hence evident that David was able to establish himself strongly at Mahanaim without being attacked by Absalom's army.—Vers. 27–29. *David receives reinforcements and provisions. Shobi*, the son of *Nahash*, from Rabbah, the capital of the Ammonites; this last statement "guards against the possible error that Shobi was a brother of Abigail" (Thenius). Rabbah, on the lower Jabbok (xii. 26-31), belonged to David's empire, and now remained true to him. Shobi, if not an Israelite, was perhaps a son of the deceased Ammonite king Nahash and brother of the Hanun (x. 1 sqq.) conquered by David (Keil), or a member of the royal house of Ammon favored by David (Ewald). [Shobi was hardly tributary king of Ammon (*Bib.-Com.*), else he would have been called king.—Tr.]—*Machir*, son of Ammiel of Lodebar, who had received Jonathan's lame son Mephibosheth into his house (ix. 4).—*Barzillai*, a Gileadite of *Rogelim*, an otherwise unknown place, mentioned besides here only in xix. 32. The Sept. (alone among the ancient versions) inserts "*ten*" before "beds" and before "basons;" but this does not agree with the connection, since the articles mentioned were brought by *several* persons for "the people" (ver. 29), and therefore certainly in considerable quantities. *Ten* would have been too few for David's "court and army" (Ew.); the insertion of this number in the Sept. was perhaps suggested by 1 Sam. xvii. 17, 18. Whether they were "fine mattress-beds" (Ew.) must be left undecided. "Basons," metallic vessels for preparing food. "Parched food" (קָלִי), comp. 1 Sam. xvii. 17. As not only corn-grains, but also pulse-beans were roasted (Bochart, *Hier.* II. 582, Harmar, *Beobacht.* I. 255 sq.), the second word may refer to pulse, of which, as well as of corn, two kinds are named; and therefore the omission of the second (קָלִי) as an error (Sept., Syr., Arab.) is unnecessary [Eng. A. V. retains it, and renders: "parched pulse"]. The last term in the list (שְׁפוֹת בָּקָר) is variously translated; Vulg.: "fat calves;" Theod.: "sucking calves;" Chald., Syr., Rabbin.: "cheese of kine (cows)" [so Eng. A. V.]. The last sense agrees better with the preceding words [Eng. A. V. incorrectly: "butter"]; the first sense accords with the "sheep" (small cattle). Sept. transfers the Heb. word: "*saphoth* of oxen." The meaning of the Heb. phrase is doubtful. The verb in this sentence ("brought") stands strangely and unnaturally after the long list of articles; it is therefore better, with Sept., Vulg., Syr., Arab., to supply a verb-form (partcp.) at the beginning of ver. 28, and then to insert "and" before the verb in ver. 29: "they brought beds, *etc.*, and gave them to David." [Eng. A. V. simply transfers the verb to the beginning of ver. 28. On the reading see "Text. and Gram." Patrick calls attention to the food of the times (only one sort of meat) as indicated by the list in vers. 28, 29, and *Bib.-Com.* remarks that God's care for David was evident in the kindness of these people.—Tr.]

b. XVIII. 1–8. *The battle in the forest of Ephraim.*

Vers. 1, 2. *David organises his army*, and disposes it for battle.—Ver. 1 sq. 1) The *mustering* of the whole body of people with David, which had been constantly growing by reinforcements from the country east of the Jordan; 2) the *division* into smaller bodies of *hundreds* and *thousands;* 3) the *organization* of the whole army in *three grand divisions* under Joab, Abishai and Ittai the Gittite, comp. xv. 29. He "gave them into the hand" (Vulg.), that is, put them under the command of Joab and the others [Eng. A. V. not so well: "sent forth under the hand"].—Vers. 3, 4. *David's attitude in respect to the impending battle.* 1) *David's declaration* that he would himself go into the fight; 2) the *declaration of the people* that they were unwilling to this, since the point was to secure his safety for the benefit of the whole people in the battle. "Thou* art as we ten thousand," that is, equal to ten thousand of us. David was to remain behind with a reserve-corps, in order in case of need to come to their help from the city, whence it may be inferred that Mahanaim was a strong place, where a stand might be made. The king agreed to this prudent proposition.† and stood at the gate-side, while the army filed out before him.—Ver. 5. *David's order respecting Absalom.* He said to the generals: **Deal gently with the young man Absalom.**—[Heb. has the *dativus commodi:* "deal me gently;" Eng. A. V.: "deal gently for my sake," a fair rendering.—Tr.] **The people heard it**, that is, from bystanders, who spread it abroad.—[The text rather says that the people heard the king give the order; the fact is mentioned to explain the answer of the man to Joab in ver. 12; notice the phrase: "in our hearing" there.—Tr.] The brief exclamation of David accords with the vividly portrayed scene and with his feeling when he saw his army going forth against his son.—Vers. 6–8. *The battle.* "The people went out *against* Israel," that

* Read אַתָּה instead of עַתָּה (obviously an error from following עַתָּה).

† [He was probably willing not to have to go in person against Absalom (*Bib.-Com.*).—Tr.]

is, David's army *made the attack.* The battle was in the **wood of Ephraim.** This name can be understood only of the forest covering the *mountains of Ephraim,* which, when the Israelites entered Canaan, stretched over the whole mountain (Josh. xvii. 15–18: "go up into the forest.—a mountain shall be thine, *for it is forest*), and was still extensive in later times; see 1 Sam. xiv. 22–26, where it is said that the children of Israel first hid from the Philistines in *mount* Ephraim (that is, in the mountain-gorges and in caves), and then that all the people came into the forest. We are thus pointed to the wooded heights in the tribe of Ephraim, not far west of the Jordan. Further, Ahimaaz (ver. 23) traverses the Jordan-valley in order to carry the news to David at Mahanaim. "Ahimaaz could not have gone this way if the battle had been on the east of the Jordan, and he wished to take a short route" (Keil). Ewald admits that the name "forest of Ephraim" seems certainly to point to the west of the river, but yet puts it on the east, because David's army returned after the victory to Mahanaim, "while, if the battle had occurred on the west side, it would obviously have been much better to stay on that side and take possession of Jerusalem." To this it need not be replied with Vaihinger (Herzog, Art. Ephraim) that "David wished to avoid further shedding of blood, and prudence and clemency dictated a return to Mahanaim;" rather it must be urged that Absalom's defeat had put an end to the insurrection (ver. 17, and xix. 9), his followers were completely broken up, and therefore an immediate occupation of Jerusalem was unnecessary. But besides, the battle was a severe one, as appears from the fact that of Absalom's army (which fought *very* bravely) twenty thousand men fell, and David's army was not in condition after the fight to make a long and rapid march to Jerusalem. Moreover, even in that case it would have been necessary for the reserve with David to join the victorious army; this junction effected (by crossing the Jordan), the whole army marched to Jerusalem under the lead of the king. Thenius holds that the forest of Ephraim was east of the Jordan, on the ground that nothing is said of Absalom's re-crossing the river (according to xvii. 28 he encamped in Gilead, east of the river), that, if he had recrossed, David (who stood only on the defensive) would have awaited another attack on his present position [Mahanaim], and that the expectation of help from the city [ver. 3] presupposes that the battle occurred near Mahanaim, to which it is to be replied that ver. 6 shows that David did not act merely on the *defensive* (he marched against Absalom), and that David's unexpected attack on Absalom's army (which could not spread out in the relatively narrow space between Mahanaim and the Jordan) may well have forced its passage across the river, so that the decisive conflict occurred in the wooded hill-region of the tribe of Ephraim. The fact that David *stayed behind* with one division in Mahanaim, and sent the three generals with their divisions against Absalom, shows clearly that he acted on the offensive. The proposed "help from the city" was only for the case that the attack was not successful, and cannot be urged in support of the view that the battle was near Mahanaim. The narrator here relates only the final and decisive conflict, it not being his purpose to describe the previous actions by which Absalom's army was forced across the Jordan. That the messengers (vers. 19–27) had then to recross the Jordan in order to reach David makes no difficulty, since the river could easily be crossed by the fords. From the eastern edge of the wooded Mount Ephraim the messengers could reach Mahanaim by rapid travel in about two hours. The assumption by some expositors of a "Forest of Ephraim" east of the Jordan, *presumedly* so called from the defeat of the Ephraimites by the Gileadites (Judg. xii. 1–5) is a mere conjecture untenable against the demonstrated geographical-historical significance of the name. [Another conjecture is that the "wood of Ephraim" was so called from the place Ephraim where Absalom had sheep-shearers (2 Sam. xiii. 23); but this has nothing in its favor, since, if the forest is to be put west of the river, the region in the tribe of Ephraim is the most natural here. Most expositors hold (against Erdmann) that the battle must have been near Mahanaim and on the east of the river, since the centre of action seems to be Mahanaim, and nothing is said of Joab's crossing the river. But in the absence of all information about a "forest of Ephraim" east of the Jordan, the question must be regarded as unsettled. Mr. Grove suggests (Smith's *Bib.-Dict.*, Art. Wood of Ephraim) that the forest may have been called after this battle, from the prominent part taken in it by the powerful tribe of Ephraim on Absalom's side; but this is not probable.—If the battle were on the east of the river Ahimaaz might still have found a quicker way to Mahanaim through the Jordan-valley; while, if it were on the west, it would seem necessary that the Cushite also should pass through this valley, and it is intimated that he did not go that way.—Tr.]—Ver. 8. Further description of the defeat of Absalom's army. The defeat was terrible because the fight spread* wide over the woody mountain-terrain, and more of Absalom's men perished in the gorges of the mountain than by the sword. "The forest of Ephraim lay no doubt in the northeastern part of the tribe-territory, towards the Jordan and Succoth" (Vaihinger), where there were deep, narrow gorges and steep declivities towards the Jordan. [It is commonly supposed that Absalom's army was far larger than David's; but we know nothing of their numbers. Twenty thousand slain is a great loss, yet not improbable under the circumstances.—The victory may be accounted for by the superior organization of David's troops and the superior generalship of his army-leaders. As to Amasa see xx. 4–6.—Tr.]

c. Vers. 9–18. *Absalom murdered by Joab.*—Ver. 9. In the tumult of the battle Absalom got into the neighborhood of "David's servants." The verb† is to be taken as strictly reflexive: "he came upon, found himself" in a position, where he saw himself already captured or slain. H;

---

* Read the Qeri נְפוֹצֶת, "scattered," Niph. Particip. fem. [of פּוּץ], instead of the Kethib נְפֻצוֹת, "dispersal" [Ges. reads נִפְצוֹת, "was scattered."—Tr.]

† יִקָּרֵא — יִקָּרֵה, Niphal. [See "Text. and Gram." —Tr.]

therefore entered a thicket, on the mule which he rode as royal prince (hence the Art.: "*the* mule"), in order to escape. His head, however, caught in (literally: "made itself fast in") the boughs of a terebinth, not merely from his large growth of hair, but doubtless also because the head was jammed in between the branches in consequence of the entanglement of the long hair; thus he was "*set*," that is, hung [Eng. A. V.: "was taken up"] between heaven and earth, since the mule went away from under him. [*Bib.-Com.*: "It would seem that the two things that his vain-glory boasted in, the royal mule and the magnificent head of hair, both contributed to his untimely death."—Tr.]—Ver. 10. Only *one* of David's men saw it and reported it to Joab as commander-in-chief. [The text does not say that "only one man" saw it, but that "a man" saw it; others may have seen it, but this man reported it.—Tr.]—Ver. 11. Joab's desire of revenge prevents him from regarding David's command given to the whole army (ver. 5). He, the highest commander, forgets himself in disobedience so far as to chide his subordinate for not killing Absalom, and tell him of the reward he had thus lost. This accords precisely with the rude passionateness, violence and barbarity of Joab's character, as before described.—**It was my affair** richly therefor to reward thee **with ten silver pieces** (= about seven dollars*) and **with a girdle** (comp. Ezek. xxiii. 15), as a valuable and essential part of military dress.—Ver. 12. The man's reply. **And though† I should weigh in** (or, on) **my hand a thousand shekels** [or pieces], that is, if they were already *given* to me, I would not do such a deed. He refers to the command of the king: **Beware, whoever‡ it be** [= all of you], of (touching) the young man. Maurer: "whoever (of you shall come on him"). [So Eng. A. V.: "beware that none touch"]. Most of the ancient versions and some [Heb.] MSS. read: "beware me of touching," *etc.*, where *me* is *Dativus commodi*; but this is to be rejected as a conjecture to avoid a difficult construction, and suggested probably by the similar phrase in ver. 5 [Eng. A. V.: "for my sake"]. David's command was to *all*, not merely to the generals (ver. 5), and to the common soldiers, one of whom here shows himself nobler-minded and more obedient than his commander.—Ver. 13. The initial word "or" (אוֹ) indicates a contrasted assertion.—The preference is to be given to the text "his life" over the marginal reading "my life." The latter is found in the Sept.: "and how shall I do wrong against my life?", and the Vulg.: "if I had boldly acted against my life," and Ewald: "if I had lied (acted deceitfully) against my conscience." Against Ewald Thenius says that the natural course of thought here is that the man should first state the act itself, and then its consequences for himself. **Or, had I dealt deceitfully against his life**, wrought falsehood by killing him, inasmuch as I should thus have acted against the express prohibition of the king. The words "and nothing is hid from the king" form a parenthesis; the apodosis begins with "and thou." **And thou wouldest have stood against me**, that is, have appeared against me before the king as accuser. For this expression comp. Ps. cix. 6; Zech. iii. 1. [On other explanations of this difficult verse see "Text. and Gram." The man's reply seems to be: "In the first place, I have too much respect for the king's command to lift my hand against his son for any reward; and in the next place, the reward would avail me nothing, for the king would find out what I had done and punish me, and you yourself would be witness against me," wherein he says plainly that he does not trust Joab. That the latter does not resent the answer by violence is perhaps to be ascribed to his consciousness of being in the wrong.—Eng. A. V. follows the marginal reading, which also gives a good sense, as does the reading of the Sept.: "the king charged thee, *etc.*, saying, Beware of doing the young man harm, and nothing will be hid from the king," *etc.*—Tr.]—Ver. 14. Joab's answer betrays his vengeful, rudely passionate nature: **I will not tarry thus with thee**, that is, lose time in myself doing what is necessary. **He took three staffs**; such is the meaning of the word (שְׁבָטִים), and not "spear, dart, spit" (comp. xxiii. 21), as Sept. and Vulg. [and Eng. A. V.] give it. Thenius therefore changes the text; but the word he proposes (שֶׁלַח) is used (as Keil remarks) in the older Hebrew only as = "missile" (Job xxxiii. 18; xxvi. 12; Joel ii. 8), and not till postexilian times in the general sense of "weapon" (2 Chr. xxiii. 10; xxxii. 5; Neh. iv. 11); and moreover no change is necessary, since our text-word signifies such sharp wooden staffs as Joab could find in the hard terebinth-wood; and this view is supported by the fact that he had to use three weapons, while one spear-thrust would have been sufficient.—The words: "and he was still alive," *etc.*, are connected with the preceding, not with the succeeding context; in the latter case they would be introduced by a Conjunction or other Particle. Joab thrust "through the heart of the still living prince" (Ewald). The hanging in the tree did not immediately produce death, though it would have done so finally.—"In the heart of the terebinth" (Ex. xv. 8) = "in the midst of the terebinth," agreeing with the description in ver. 9. This expression Böttcher would unnecessarily change to: "in the thicket (עָב) of the terebinth."—Ver. 15. After Joab's thrust in the heart, Absalom is killed by ten of Joab's young men, probably at his command.—[Thus neither the hanging nor the thrusts in the heart produced death. This, if surprising, is by no means impossible. On Wellhausen's unnecessary re-disposition of the text (putting ver. 16 before ver. 15) see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]—Ver. 16. By Absalom's death the end of the battle was secured, and Joab therefore called the people off from further pursuit. The motive for his barbarous slaying of Absalom was not *private revenge*

* [This sum would be equivalent to one hundred dollars at the present day.—On the various kinds of ancient girdles (a necessary article of dress for men and women), including that of the high-priest, and on the custom of presenting them as gifts (still found in Persia), see Art. *Girdle* in Smith's Bib.-Dict.—Tr.]

† Read Qeri לוֹ, with most ancient versions.

‡ On this construction of מִי with aposiopesis see Ex. xxiv. 14; Judg. vii. 3, and below, vers. 22, 33. Ewald, § 104 *d*, *a*. לִי for מִי is conjecture.

(Kurtz in Herzog), but revenge for the honor of the ejected king, and the conviction that only his death could put an end to the unhappy civil war. He stopped the pursuit, however, *because he wished to spare the people*, that is, Absalom's people. A piece of clemency alongside of his barbarity! [The rendering of Eng. A. V. is better: "he held back the people" from pursuit. The phrase "the people" here naturally refers to David's (and Joab's) people.—Tr.]—Ver. 17. Absalom cast aside. **And they threw over it a very great heap of stones**, a sign of embittered feeling against a dead man. [In his translation Erdmann has: "over him."—Tr.] The great *heap of stones* over the pit (the Art. denotes the *well-known* pit into which Absalom's corpse was thrown) was to be a monument of shame for his crime;* comp. Josh. vii. 26 (Achan), viii. 29 (the king of Ai). **All Israel had fled, every man to his tent**, that is, all of Absalom's army (gathered from all Israel) that survived the defeat; this also confirms the view that the battle took place on the west of the Jordan. [But they would have fled to their homes, no matter where the battle was fought.—Tr.]—Ver. 18. In sharp contrast with this mention of the monument of shame stands the following account of the monument that the vain and ambitious Absalom had set up in his own honor during his lifetime. The word "took" [Eng. A. V. "had taken"] (Num. xvi. 1; 1 Kings xi. 37) is pleonastic, as is common in circumstantial and vivid narration: ["took and reared" = "reared"]. But it may be understood as = "took for himself," not pleonastic (Böttcher). The form of the pillar (probably of stone) cannot be determined. **In the king's dale**, the valley of the Kidron, two stadia east of Jerusalem (Jos. *Ant.* 7, 10, 3); it took its name from the event described in Gen. xiv. 17, and was in later times called also the valley of Jehoshaphat. The "Absalom's pillar" of ecclesiastical tradition, shown even in the Middle Ages, and to-day called "Absalom's grave," a pyramidal pointed monument about forty feet high,† cannot in its present form be the work of Absalom. See Thenius' excellent argument against the view of Winer and Ewald, that the "king's dale" was north of Jerusalem, perhaps (according as the Salem in Gen. xiv. 18 is understood) not far from Salem, a northern city on the Jordan.—**I have no son**, comp. xiv. 27; his three sons there mentioned must have afterwards died. "It is called to this day *Absalom's Hand*" (1 Sam. xv. 12), a monument recalling his memory like an uplifted *hand*. This monument of honor (whether it was "adorned with a splendid inscription of his name" (Ew.) must be left to the imagination) he had himself erected during his life; that monument of shame in the wood of Ephraim was set up by others after his terrible death. A significant contrast!

d. Vers. 19–32. *The tidings of joy and grief. David's lament over Absalom.*

Ver. 19. *Ahimaaz*, the son of Zadok, who with Jonathan (xvii. 15 sq.) had brought to David the information concerning Absalom's design, and had remained with the army. He wishes to bear to the king the tidings that **the Lord has judged the king** [= done him justice] **from the hand of his enemies**—the theocratic conception of an immediate divine interposition.—Ver. 20. Joab refuses the request. His reason is: "because* the king's son is dead." He says: **Thou art not a messenger to-day** [Eng. A. V.: "thou shalt not bear tidings this day"], because he knew that David, notwithstanding the victory, would be deeply moved by the news of Absalom's death. He did not wish to expose Ahimaaz to the king's anger, and therefore refused to let him carry the tidings.—Ver. 21. He rather committed this task to the *Cushite*, the Ethiopian slave, whom he had at hand for all sorts of work. The name is gentilic, not the proper name of an Israelite (Sept., Vulg. [Eng. A. V.]). After the manner of a slave, he cast himself down before Joab. Grotius: "he sent an Ethiopian, thinking it small damage if he received hurt from the king."—Ver. 22 sqq. A remarkably vivid description of the lively conversation between Joab and Ahimaaz. The latter says: "but happen what may† [Eng. A. V.: "however"], let me run;" he thought more of the victory than of the death. Joab still refuses, but gives an exacter reason than before. "Why wilt thou run? if thou go, **the message is not** *a reward-bringing one*,"‡ not such a one as will bring thee profit (Böttcher). Luther: "thou wilt not carry a good message." Thenius alters the text after the Sept., and renders: "there is to thee no message leading to profit." But according to the explanation given above, there is no need for such insertion and alteration. [Eng. A. V.: "thou hast no tidings ready," but the signification "ready" is not easily gotten from the Hebrew word. Better: "thou hast no tidings sufficient" (*Bib. Com.*); that is, the Cushite has already carried the news; or, "thou hast no profitable tidings," none that can do any body good. The Syr. is as Erdmann's rendering, the Vulg. as Luther's. See "Text. and Gramm."—Tr.]—Ver. 23. In the quick and lively account of the

* [The custom still exists, in respect to robbers, for example. See Thomson, *Land and Book*, II. 234.—Tr.]

† See an exact description of it in Titus Tobler's *Siloahquelle und der Œlberg* (1852), p. 267 sqq. [Its base is surrounded by Ionic pillars; it is doubtful whether it is a tomb. See Robinson I. 350.—Tr.]

* Read the Qeri כִּי עַל־כֵּן (the כֵּן has evidently fallen out by reason of the following בֵּן); it = "because" (Gen. xviii. 5; xix. 8), see Ges. § 155, 2 *d*. Maurer [so Syr., Chald.,] retains the Kethib (כִּי עַל) and renders: "for concerning the king's son as dead (thou wouldest have to carry tidings)." But 1) this addition [of a sentence to the construction] is suspicious, and 2) if מֵת ["dead"] belonged to "the king's son" as Adjective, it must have the Article.

† וִיהִי מָה. Comp. Ew. § 104 *d*: *quidquid id est.*

‡ לָמָּה וּלְכָה אֵין־בְּשׂרָה מֹצֵאת is here permissive Imperative (Böttcher, Thenius): "go thou" = "and if thou go" (as תְּנָה, Ps. viii. 2 [1]). It can be taken (with Preposition) as Pronoun = לְךָ (Gen. xxvii. 37) only where it is conditioned by the *word-tone* (Böttcher), as Num. xxii. 33; 1 Sam. i. 26; Psalm cxli. 8. Here, however, אֵין, not לְכָה (as = *thee*), has the tone, for the message was profitable for *nobody*. Thenius: לְבֶצַע מוֹצֵאת, Hiph. Particp. of יָצָא. But the word is Act. Qal. Particp. of מצא, "to come upon"—"that comes on (finds)" an end or a reward.

conversation, the phrase "and he said" (easily supplied by the reader) is omitted, as in 1 Sam. i. 20. The repetition of the "and be it as it may" shows Ahimaaz's ardent desire to carry the tidings to David. He went "by the way of the plain,"* the Jordan valley (Gen. xiii. 10–12; xix. 17, 25, 29; Deut. xxxiv. 3; 1 Ki. vii. 47). As "way" has here a local meaning, it cannot be explained as indicating a particular *manner* of running (Ewald: "he ran in the manner of the Kikkar (plain-) running"). [Erdmann supposes this statement to support the view that the battle was fought on the west of the river; but it has already been pointed out (see note on ver. 6) that it is here intimated that the Cushite did not go by the way of the Jordan-valley, which he must have done if he had come from the west to the east side. (*Bib. Com.* also calls attention to this fact in note on ver. 23.) Assuming that the scene of battle was on the east, the paths of Ahimaaz and the Cushite cannot be described with exactness; but if it was south-west of Mahanaim and near the river, the Cushite may have struck in over the hills, while Ahimaaz took the more level northward route along the river, and then passed in to Mahanaim (so Patrick). See *Bib. Comm. in loco.*—Tr.] Vers. 24–27. That the two runners are *seen* by the *watchman* confirms the view that they both came through the Jordan-valley, and so could be seen afar off coming *one after the other*. The Cushite is seen in the same direction as Ahimaaz, and therefore they could not have come different ways (Thenius).—Ver. 24. David sat **between the two gates** (that is, in the space between the outer and the inner gate) waiting for tidings. **The watchman went up to the roof of the gate on the wall.**—That is, the outer gate connected with the city-wall.—Ver. 25. [The watchman reports to the king the approach of a runner.] The king said: **If he be alone, there is good tidings† in his mouth.**—He has been despatched as a messenger. If the result was bad, several would come as fugitives.—Ver. 26. The watchman, seeing another man running, called out *to the gate;*‡ "for here, at the farthest possible distance from the outer gate, the king must have taken his position, if he wished also to *see* the watchman on the flat roof" (Thenius). **He also,** said the king, **brings good tidings**—namely, since he comes alone.—Ver. 27. The watchman recognizes Ahimaaz, probably by the swiftness of his running. The king said, **He is a good man,** whom Joab would not have chosen as the messenger of evil.

Vers. 28–32. *The double message.*—Ahimaaz called out: **Hail!** [or, Peace! Eng. A. V. giving the sense: All is well!—Tr.] The brief exclamation corresponds to the haste of the runner, and gives David assurance of victory. It was understood, as a matter of course, that Ahimaaz would report on *this* point first. "The Lord hath *shut up* (the ground-meaning of the Verb is to be retained) thy enemies;" that is, the Lord has set bounds to thy enemies in their revolt, has surrounded and embraced them with His power, so that they can no longer stir. So Sept. and Vulg. Comp. 1 Sam. xvii. 46; xxiv. 19; xxvi. 8; Am. i. 6, 9; Ps. xxxi. 9 [8].—Ver. 29. To David's question concerning Absalom, Ahimaaz answers evasively. I saw, says he, **the great tumult.**—He describes it from personal observation—hence the Article. In the first part of Ahimaaz's answer, Vulg., Luther and Michaelis render: "when the king's servant, Joab, sent me, thy servant;" but "the king's servant" is not the subject of the verbal form (Infin.), and besides the copula ("*and* thy servant") renders this translation impossible, unless the text be altered and the copula omitted. "The king's servant" is the *Cushite*, while Ahimaaz calls himself "thy servant." The *subject* of the sentence, *Joab*, stands (as sometimes occurs in such Infinitive-constructions) after the object (so Josh. xiv. 11; Isa. v. 24; xxix. 23; xx. 1; Ezra ix. 8; Ps. lvi. 1 [title]; 2 Chron. xii. 1. Comp. Ges. § 133, 3 Rem). [Dr. Erdmann renders here as Eng. A. V. Perhaps a better text would be: "when Joab sent thy servant;" it is not likely that Ahimaaz would call the Cushite "the king's servant," or mention him at all. See "Text. and Gramm."—Tr.] Ahimaaz is unwilling to give the sad news; but he not only keeps back the truth, but makes the false impression that Absalom's fate was not decided when Joab sent him off.—Ver. 30. Meantime the Cushite has arrived. At David's command Ahimaaz stepped to one side (literally: "turned about"). The Cushite speaks in completely theocratic style: "The Lord hath done thee justice on thy enemies."—Ver. 32 sq. He answers the question about Absalom indirectly, yet so as not only clearly to make known his death, but also to express condemnation of his hostile attempt against his father and king. The Cushite refers to God's punitive justice in Absalom's destruction—a fact that David in this moment of heart-rending grief loses sight of.—Ver. 33 [Heb. xix. 1]. "And the king was shaken"* [Eng. A. V.: "was much moved"]. David's behaviour is so vividly and touchingly portrayed as only an eye-witness could do it. Augustine (*cont. Gaud.* II. 14): "Absalom afflicted his father more by his death than by his life."

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The *religious-moral character* of David's disposition of heart is clearly expressed in the *Psalms*

* כִּכַּר with or without הַיַּרְדֵּן.

† [The word (בְּשֹׂרָה) sometimes means good tidings, sometimes bad tidings, sometimes simply tidings; the meaning in any particular case must be decided by the context. Here either "tidings" or "good tidings" would give a proper sense.—Tr.]

‡ Read שַׁעַר "gate" instead of שֹׁעֵר "porter." [This change of the text (after Sept., Vulg., Syr.) seems hardly necessary. The watchman may have called to the porter, and the porter to the king. The expression "called to (or, towards) the gate" is certainly possible and intelligible, but still strange and unexampled. The fact that the porter is not said to speak to the king makes some difficulty, but not enough to call for a change of text.—Tr.]

* Vulg.: *contristatus est,* "was grieved." [Erdmann gives the Sept. rendering of this word (וַיִּרְגַּז) as ἐδάκρυσεν (wept), which he rightly characterizes as weak; but though this word is given in the text of Stier and Theile's Polyglot (an eclectic text), both the Vatican and the Alexandrian texts have the strong and appropriate rendering, ἐταράχθη, "violently perturbed."—Tr.]

pertaining to this gloomy time, through which the experiences of the royal singer have become the common possession of the theocratic community, and the source of comfort and strength to innumerable pious hearts. While Pss. xli. and lv. belong to the time of the development of Absalom's insurrection, *Pss. iii. and iv.* are to be referred to the time *immediately after David's flight;* for the particulars see Ewald, Hengstenberg, Delitzsch, and Moll [in Lange's *Bible-Work*]. Indeed, the *time of day* that gives coloring to each Psalm may be determined. They are not, however, *both* evening-songs, as Hengstenberg holds, who refers them to the evening of the day of flight; but *Ps. iii.* is a *morning-song* (J. H. Mich., Ew., Del., Moll), written after that dreadful day and the following night in which Ahithophel would have surprised him, and only *Ps. iv.* is to be regarded as an *evening-song*, whether written the day of the flight or the next day. "There is indeed," says Moll on Ps. iii., "no *special* note of time, and the absence of such note is felt by many expositors to be a difficulty. But they fail to consider that we have here a specifically lyrical-religious effusion, which is not the expression of the feelings of an anxious father (as 2 Sam. xvi. 11), but sets forth the complaint and the confidence of faith of a commander and king (hard-pressed indeed, but cheerful in prayer) in such terse sentences and vigorous words that the reader hears the royal singer sigh, cry, weep from the bottom of his heart." The first strophe of Ps. iii. (the title of which is: "Psalm of David when he fled from Absalom his son"), vers. 2, 3 [1, 2] describes his *distress* by reason of his numerous enemies, who revile him for his trust in God. In the second strophe, vers. 4, 5 [3, 4] he indicates his *ground of hope*, namely that God, who has lifted up his head, will help and hear him. In the third strophe, vers. 6, 7 [5, 6] he expresses his *confidence of faith*, based on the experience of the Lord's protection during the past night, to which this morning bears testimony. The fourth strophe, vers. 8, 9 [7, 8] contains a *prayer* for deliverance and blessing, growing out of his *confidence of faith* and his *ground of hope*.—*Ps. iv.*, as an *evening-song*, is a cry of the sorely-pressed singer to "*his refuge of righteousness*," the creator and possessor of righteousness, the judge of unrighteousness, the protector and restorer of persecuted righteousness. Ver. 2 [1] contains (with a reference to already experienced help) a *prayer* that God would hear him, vers. 9 [8], the *confident conviction* of its fulfilment. "The pillars of the bridge (vers. 3–8) between distress and deliverance, prayer and confidence, are: 1) God's choice of the singer, and the enemies' opposition to the divine decision; 2) the singer's sincere piety (vers. 4 [3]), the hypocritical and external religiosity of the enemies (see the words of ver. 6 [5]: 'offer the sacrifices of righteousness'); 3) the singer's living trust in God, vers. 7, 8 [6, 7], while the enemies trust in human helps; comp. the 'trust in the Lord,' ver. 6 [5] (Hengstenberg). To these two Psalms we must add *Ps. lxiii.* on account of its direct reference to David's stay as fugitive west of the Jordan. The title: "Psalm of David when he was in the wilderness of Judah" is confirmed by the agreement of the expressions, "thirsting in a dry land, without water," with 2 Sam. xvi. 2, 14; xvii. 29, compared with xv. 23, 28; xvii. 16. The mention of the sanctuary, ver. 3 [2] and the royal office, ver. 12 [11] forces us to refer it to the flight from Absalom, not to the Sauline persecution. The singer, "pining in the wilderness," desires that God may be as near to him (ver. 2 [1]) as He formerly was in the sanctuary, of which he is now, alas! deprived (ver. 3 [2]). His *highest good* and only *comfort* is *God's grace*, which is "better than life," and his *communion* with God (vers. 2–4 [1–3]), wherein he now even in suffering rejoices (vers. 7–9 [6–8]), having also the joyful *hope* for the future that the Lord will bless him (vers. 5, 6 [4, 5]) and judge his enemies (vers. 10, 11 [9, 10]), both of these being combined in ver. 12 [11]: "But the king will rejoice in God; every one that sweareth by Him (God) shall glory; for the mouth of them that speak lies shall be stopped." To the time of distress, when he was on the *east of the Jordan*, belong *Pss. lxi.* and *lxii.* *Ps. lxi.* expresses first the sorrowful feeling of homelessness, and removal from the sanctuary, whence the psalmist is banished to the "end of the earth" (ver. 3 [2]). All the more earnestly does he *pray* from afar (vers. 2–5 [1–4]) for *deliverance from the evil*, which he likens to a steep rock, and which he cannot escape without God's *guidance* (ver. 3 [2]), appealing to God's former *acts* of help (ver. 4 [3]), and *begging* for protection in the "tabernacle" (ver. 5 [4]). In vers. 6–9 [5–8] he states the *ground* of his *confident prayer*, referring to the prophetic word that assures him an everlasting dominion, himself affirming this dominion (on the ground of 2 Sam. vii., especially ver. 29), and closing with joyous thanksgiving for the mercy and truth that would defend him. In *Ps. lxii.* David first affirms his trust in God, and the truth that rest and salvation are in Him alone (vers. 2, 3 [1, 2]). The wickedness of his enemies, who wish to deprive him of his God-given *dignity* and of his *life*, drives him to God (vers. 4, 5 [3, 4]). He calls on his soul to seek God only (6–8 [5–7]), and invites all to trust Him (ver. 9 [8]), warning against trust in all else (10, 11 [9, 10]), and giving in conclusion as the ground of all this God's mighty power and love. Vers. 5, 6 [4, 5], referring to attempts of enemies against his *dignity* and *life*, touch Pss. iii. and iv., and point to the time of Absalom. Ewald: "From ver. 5 [4] the enemies seem to be slanderous fellow-citizens, who, relying on a newly-established power, attempt to cast the psalmist down to the ground and destroy him, because they cannot bear his spiritual superiority." Closely allied with this Psalm is *Ps. xxxix.*, which is therefore properly referred by several commentators (for example, Delitzsch) to the Absalomic time. David first declares that in the presence of the ungodly he was *submissively silent*, in order that he might avoid sin (vers. 2, 3 *a* [1, 2 *a*]). Yet he gave utterance to his burning grief (3 *b*, 4 [2 *b*, 3]), and *prays* to be taught how brief is the measure of his days (5, 6 [4, 5]). The *nothingness* of human things forbids trust in them, therefore he will *wait on the Lord alone* (7, 8 [6, 7]). On this is founded next the prayer to be delivered from transgression, and from the reproach of the ungodly (9 [8]). He will not complain, indeed ("for *thou*, thou hast done it"), but he prays for deliverance, lest he be destroyed (10–12 [9–11]). Since he is

only a sojourner and pilgrim, he prays that help may be given him before he departs.—To this time belong also Ps. xlii. and xliii., which together form a whole. The Psalmist is east of the Jordan (xlii. 7 [6]), and sorrowfully recalls the time when at the head of the rejoicing multitude (comp. 2 Sam. vi. 14) he went to the house of the Lord (ver. 5 [4]), lamenting the present desolation of the sanctuary by the enemy, who mock at him as one forsaken by God, in a land far from any holy place. With this is combined desire and hope of sharing in the service of the sanctuary. In both Psalms the enemies are described as internal as in the Absalomic psalms. Comp. Ps. xliii. 1: "Judge me, O God, and plead my cause against a people without love [*i. e.*, 'ungodly'—Tr.]; deliver me from the deceitful and unjust man." Thrice in the same words (xlii. 6 [5], 12 [11], xliii. 5) the Psalmist bids his unquiet soul "hope in God." Not from the soul of David, indeed (Hengst., Thol.), but from his own soul does the Korahite psalmist [the title ascribes the song to the Sons of Korah] utter his lamentations and hopes; but the tones of the song are the same as those of the Davidic psalms of this time.—Further, *Ps. xxiii., xxvi.—xxviii.* owe their origin to the outward and inward experiences of the royal singer at this time (Del., Moll). In all of them the psalmist is far from the sanctuary, and longs to worship God in His house; in all there is the sharp contrast between the oppression of enemies, and trust in God. The refreshing aid of friends, narrated in 2 Sam. xvii. 27 sq., he extols in *Ps. xxiii.* as the kindness of God, his good shepherd; here we recognize the tones of Pss. iii. 7 [6]; iv. 8 [7]; lxiii.—The enemies, described in *Ps. xxvi.* are identical in character with the abettors of the insurrection of Absalom. The psalmist appeals to his righteous life, and to the tribunal of God, and prays not to be carried off with sinners, from whom he has ever been separate, and by reason of his love for the sanctuary will still be separate; confidently he looks for help from the Lord, and restoration to the sanctuary.—While this Psalm closes in joyful hope, *Ps. xxvii.* begins with the expression of happy confidence in God, affirms the hope of victory over enemies, and vows a thank-offering for deliverance to the Lord in His sanctuary.—*Ps. xxviii.* (in many respects similar to Ps. xxvii.) is a passionate cry in the midst of danger for requital on enemies, and for deliverance for the Lord's Anointed and for His people. It closes with: "the Lord is the saving strength of His *Anointed*. O help thy people and bless thy heritage, and feed them and bear them up forever."*

2. In these psalms are contained the following truths, valid for all times and relations of the kingdom of God, especially for times of depression and convulsion. The Lord permits such times to come to purify His people, and by sifting to determine who are for Him and who against Him, and for both these classes they contain lessons. The former [God's people] are, as David, 1) in humble penitence to confess that their own sins have helped to bring distress on God's kingdom; 2) to learn, for the strengthening of their faith, that not human power and wisdom, but God's, conduct and further the affairs of His kingdom; 3) to see, for their consolation, that no human power shall long hinder, or even destroy this kingdom, and 4) to recall, for their joy, God's *deeds* in the past, which He has not performed in vain, and His sure *promises*, which will not be left unfulfilled.—On the other hand, the enemies of God's kingdom are to reflect that they are only instruments in His hand for chastising His house, that their anti-godly work has its limits in the will and command of the Almighty God, and that they can escape His wrath only by humbly bowing under His hand and giving Him the honor.

3. The *faithfulness* of *human love*, strengthening in need and cheering in misfortune, is not only the *copy*, but also the *means* and *instrument* of the *faithfulness of the divine love*, granted to those that bow humbly beneath God's hand, and wholly trust Him.

4. In the *contest* for the *holy cause of the kingdom of God* all those that are called to defend it, must thoroughly combine all the forces that willingly offer themselves, in order to overcome the power of evil. But, with all bravery and all anger against evil, the servant of God must guard against sinful fleshly anger, and bring God's merciful love as near as possible to the authors of the evil, in order to afford them the opportunity and means of conversion, and to save them from destruction. While their evil *cause* falls under the *divine judgment*, through *human hands*, the human hand is not arbitrarily and self-led to be laid on their *persons*, but to commend them to God, whether they may not be brought to repentance by His long-suffering, by the failure of their wicked undertakings and the exhibition therein given of God's punitive justice.

5. He who (as Joab), self-determined, angry, merely executing strict justice, anticipating God's judgment, sits in judgment on his neighbor and executes judgment on him, himself falls under the divine judgment. Comp. 1 Ki. ii. 28–34.

6. David's lament over Absalom, as a father's lament over his lost son, was not in itself in conflict with his theocratic calling, with all his force, to restore the kingdom of God, on the ground of God's promises to him, against his son, even at the cost of his destruction. Peter Martyr: "in his heart two feelings met, grief for his son and joy in the divine judgment, so that he could say: just art thou, O Lord, thy judgment is right. But these feelings of joy and grief, being contrary to one another, could not have place together in his mind." It is psychologically perfectly natural and ethically unexceptionable to feel *grief* at the judicial destruction of a human life and soul near and dear to us, as David here for Absalom, and at the same time to give place to *anger* at the unauthorized intrusion of a violent human hand into the course of divine judgment on a lost man, whose *soul* might else have been saved. But one may easily sin (as David did) in such justifiable sorrow and anger, by weakly yielding to passionate excitement, and holding merely to the human, so that the eye of the spirit loses sight of the earnestness of the divine justice, which permits

* [It is clear that the internal proofs here adduced by the author of the origination of these Psalms (especially xxiii., xxvi.—xxviii., xlii., xliii.) in the insurrection of Absalom are of a very general nature, and cannot be considered as a demonstration. The lessons drawn from them, however, are not the less valid from the uncertainty of the authorship.—Tr.]

unauthorized human intrusion into its plans, in order thus to complete itself, and to secure *its* ends over all human thoughts and weakly human feelings. Kurtz (*Herz.* III. 304): "Absalom's sin and shame had two sides: there was in it the curse that David's sin brought on David's house (2 Sam. xii. 10), the misdeed of the fathers, that is visited on the children (Ex. xx. 5),—and not less Absalom's own wickedness and recklessness, which made him the bearer of the family-curse. David looks at Absalom's deed not on the *latter* side, but on the *former* (for his own guilt seems to him so great, that he looks little at Absalom's); hence his deep, boundless compassion for his misguided son."—This king's path was full of tears. He wept when he parted from Jonathan and went into banishment; he wept when Saul and Jonathan perished; he wept over the death of the son of Bathsheba begotten in adultery; he wept over the murder of his son Amnon by Absalom; he wept when, a dethroned fugitive, he ascended the Mount of Olives; he mentions the tears that he so often shed on his lonesome bed; he weeps most violently and longest over Absalom's terrible end, since he saw herein the culmination of God's judgments on his house, which he had incurred by his sin. Augustine: "Not in his life does he weep for him, but when he is dead, because all hope of salvation for him was then cut off." But his *unrestrained* tears, his *immoderate grief*, as the following narrative shows, obscured his view of the divine judgment, that of necessity came upon Absalom on account of *his own* reckless wickedness.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Chap. xvii. 24—xviii. 8. *The proof of genuine fidelity in troubled times:* 1) By willing gifts of love to relieve bodily need; 2) By swift help in battle against an evil foe; 3) By offering our own person to save the dear life of our friend; and 4) By tenderly showing forbearance towards his wounded heart in the conflict against the author of his distress.—*God wonderfully helps His people in battling for the interests of His kingdom:* 1) By awakening and revealing hidden and faithful love, which consoles and refreshes (xvii. 24-29); 2) By collecting brave soldiers, who shrink not from taking part in the battle (xviii. 1-4); 3) By securing glorious victory even against the apparently superior foe (vers. 5-8).

XVIII. 5-16. *Divine righteousness and human compassion towards the adversaries of God's kingdom:* 1) *Divine righteousness* in executing its judgment upon wickedness and the wicked goes its own way, independently of the feelings of human compassion for their purification and rectification. Yet 2) *Human compassion* is not excluded by thinking of the earnestness of the divine righteousness; but as a daughter of the divine compassion, when engaged in delivering a human life from eternal ruin, it has a right to ask that it may glory against judgment, so far as in the counsel of God patience and long-suffering is still resolved on.

Vers. 9-18. *Heaven-wide opposites that cannot be reconciled:* 1) *God's* strict *righteousness*, when the measure of His holy wrath is full, and *human compassion*, when the measure of the divine patience and long-suffering is full; 2) Rude *exercise of power*, which in self-will and recklessness destroys a human life, and tender *conscientiousness*, which fears to strive against God by attempts upon a human life; 3) The *honor*, which man in his pride prepares for himself before the world, and the *shame*, with which God punishes such pride.

Vers. 19-33. *Sweet and bitter* in the leadings and dispensations of God: 1) From *one source*—the Lord's wise counsel; 2) For *one and the same human heart*—in order to humble and exalt it; 3) To a *like end*—the Lord's glory.

Fr. Arndt: *David's victory over Absalom*—how it is 1) prepared, 2) gained, and 3) crowned.

Chap. vii. 27-29. Schlier: In the fidelity of men David was to recognize the fidelity of the Lord; he was to take courage from the fact that the Lord, who is such a friend, and in the midst of his wretchedness has cared for him, will also care for him still further, and help him out of all his wretchedness. Precisely thus, at the present day also, the Lord our God deals with His children. He leads us into trouble, it is true, but in the midst of trouble He sends us refreshing again.—Starke: So God knows how to refresh His people in time of need, even through strangers, from whom nothing would have been expected (Psalm xxxiv. 11 [10]; xxxvii. 19).—S. Schmid: A righteous cause finds everywhere its supporters and defenders.

Chap. xviii. 1 sqq. Fr. Arndt: O when a man first reaches the point that he is lord of his pain, that no longer sorrow rules over him, but he rules over his sorrow, that thoughtfulness, quiet and peace returns into his heart, then he is again in a good way, no more brought to a stand but in progress, and a door is opened for all help and deliverance.—Osiander: Though we ought to trust God, yet we ought in so doing to neglect nothing that we have and can fitly use to turn away the evil.—[Henry: It is no piece of wisdom to be stiff in our resolutions, but to be willing to hear reason, even from our inferiors, and to be overruled by their advice, when it appears to be for our own good. Whether the people's prudence had an eye to it or no, God's providence wisely ordered it that David should not be in the field of battle; for then his tenderness had certainly interposed to save Absalom's life, whom God had determined to destroy.—Tr.]

Vers. 4-8: Schlier: Easy gained, easy lost. Absalom's example shows that. And to-day also, in great as in small things, how can it be otherwise than according to the saying, Easy gained, easy lost. But another thing we also clearly see from this history: If God is left, we are not forsaken. David held fast to his God, even when the world stormed in upon him from all sides. Let us hold fast to the Lord, let us perseveringly wait for His help. To us also He will at the right time assuredly send help.—[Henry: Absalom and David . . . . . each did his utmost, and showed what he could do; how bad it is possible for a child to be to the best of fathers, and how good it is possible for a father to be to the worst of children; as if it were designed to be a resemblance of man's wickedness towards God, and God's mercy toward man, of which it is hard to say which is more amazing.—Tr.]

Ver. 9. Starke: God punishes the disobedience of children to their parents very severely (Prov. xxx. 17; xx. 20; Deut. xxvii. 16).—Osiander: Those who are puffed up with the gifts that God has granted them, and misuse them for the ends of arrogance and luxury, are often brought by these very gifts to ruin.—S. Schmid: A man whom the divine vengeance is pursuing does not escape.—Vers. 14 sqq. S. Schmid: He must be a very bad man who is not attracted to what is good by the good example of his subordinates.—Ver. 17 sq. Cramer: As the death of the saints is precious (Psa. cxvi. 15), so on the contrary the death of the ungodly is little esteemed and horrible (Psa. xxxiv. 22).—Starke: As the memory of the just is blessed (Prov. x. 7), so the memory of the ungodly abides in dishonor and shame.

Vers. 19 sq. Starke: Joy is always the beginning of sorrow, and good and evil fortunes are in this world always mingled.—Hedinger [from Hall]: O how welcome deserve those messengers to be that bring us the glad tidings of salvation, that assure us of the foil of all spiritual enemies, and tell us of nothing but victories, and crowns, and kingdoms.—Ver. 28. Starke: When one has obtained a victory, he should ascribe it to God Himself, and not to human powers (2 Chron. xxv. 8).

Ver. 29. Schlier: David knows well how to bring his duty as ruler into harmony with his duty to his family; for he has a kingly heart full of kingly thoughts, and yet has also a faithful fatherly heart, full of love and compassion, and who should not be glad to learn from such a man? We recognize the upright man in the fidelity he shows to both his calling and his kinsmen, and he who little esteems the one or the other does not rightly do his duty. [It is not necessary to maintain that David did just right in the matter. Certainly he sometimes erred very greatly; and in this case his parental fondness seems to have overbalanced his sense of duty as a king.—Tr.]—Vers. 42 sq. S. Schmid: Pious parents are justly more anxious for their dissolute children than for the pious and obedient, because they are nearer to ruin.—Berl. Bible: God is the true and only source of all parental love and all the compassion which parents maintain even towards their ungodly Absaloms.—[Taylor: But the worst ingredient in this cup of anguish would be, I think, the consciousness in David's heart that if he had himself been all he ought to have been, his son might not thus have perished. .... David now professes, and I believe with truth, to desire that he had died for Absalom; but that was a vain wish. He ought to have lived more for Absalom. He ought, by his own character, to have taught him to love holiness, or, at all events, he ought to have seen that there was nothing in his own conduct to encourage his son in wickedness, or to provoke him to wrath; and then, though Absalom had made shipwreck, he might have had the consolation that he had done his utmost to prevent such a catastrophe.—Tr.]

[Ver. 14. *The death of Absalom:* 1) He has missed his golden opportunity. (He slighted Ahithophel's counsel, and now David has organized a strong army.) 2) He has fought desperately, but in vain (ver. 6). 3) The very objects of his vanity have occasioned his ignominy (riding the royal mule, his long hair). 4) His father's often abused fondness continues to the end, but no longer avails him (xiii. 39; xviii. 5, 11-15, 33). 5) His splendid gifts and reckless ambition have brought him only ruin, and destined him to immortal infamy (vers. 17, 18).—Tr.]

[Ver. 33. *David mourning over Absalom:* 1) Wherein it was *right.* *a*) Parental love is indestructible. *b*) Absalom was not wholly bad, and his faults had been aggravated by the misconduct of others. *c*) David was conscious that all this was a chastening required by his own sins. 2) Wherein it was *wrong.* *a*) In that it excluded gratitude to his faithful and brave followers (xix. 1 sqq.). *b*) In preventing attention to the pressing duties of his position (xix. 7). *c*) In causing him to overlook the fact that as long as Absalom lived, the kingdom could have no peace. *d*) In so far as it was not tempered by submission to the will of Jehovah.—Tr.]

THIRD SECTION.

The Restoration of David's Royal Authority, which was now Endangered by Dissension between Judah and Israel and by the Insurrection of Sheba.

CHAPTERS XIX.—XX.

I. *The Way opened for the Restoration of David's Kingdom by Joab's Reproof of his Immoderate Grief for Absalom.* Chap. XIX. 1–8 [Heb. 2–9].

1 AND it was told Joab, Behold, the king weepeth and mourneth for Absalom.
2 And the victory [deliverance][1] that day was *turned* into mourning unto all the
people; for the people heard say that day how [*om.* how, *ins.* :] The king was [is]
3 grieved for his son. And the people gat them by stealth that day into the city, as
4 people being ashamed steal away when they flee in battle. But [And] the king
covered[2] his face, and the king cried with a loud voice, O my son Absalom, O
5 Absalom, my son, my son! And Joab came into the house to the king, and said,
Thou hast shamed this day the faces of all thy servants, which [who] this day have
saved thy life, and the lives of thy sons and of thy daughters, and the lives of thy
wives, and the lives of thy concubines, in that thou lovest thine enemies, and hatest
6 thy friends. For thou hast declared this day that thou regardest neither [not]
princes nor [and] servants; for this day I perceive that, if[3] Absalom had lived
7 and all we had died this day, then it had pleased thee well. Now, therefore [And
now], arise, go forth, and speak comfortably unto thy servants; for I swear by the
Lord [Jehovah], if[4] thou go not forth, there will not tarry one with thee this
night; and[5] that will be worse unto thee than all the evil that befel [hath befallen]
8 thee from thy youth until now. Then [And] the king arose, and sat in the gate.
And they told unto all the people, saying, Behold, the king doth sit in the gate;
and all the people came before the king. [*Transfer the rest of this verse to the next verse.*[6]]

II. *David prepares for his Return by Negotiations with the Men of Judah.* Vers. 9–14 [Heb. 10–15].

9 For [And] Israel had fled, every man to his tent. And all the people were at
strife throughout all the tribes of Israel, saying, The king saved us out of the
hand of our enemies, and he delivered us out of the hand of the Philistines; and

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 2. תְּשֻׁעָה, properly "salvation, deliverance," not the idea of a conquering of enemies, but of being saved from them.—TR.]

[2] [Ver. 4. Instead of לָאַט, Wellhausen would write לָאט as if from לוּט (1 Sam. xxi. 10).—TR.]

[3] [Ver. 6. Conditional sentence, in which condition and consequence are represented as non-existent; the protasis with לֻא (= לוּ) and Adjective (or Participle), the apodosis with the Perfect. The action is stated in the simplest form: "if Absalom is living, it is right," it being otherwise understood that Absalom is not living.—TR.]

[4] [Ver. 7. Conditional sentence, in which both members are undetermined, put as mere possibilities. The protasis is in the form of simple assertion (אִם אֵינְךָ), the apodosis has the Imperf. (יָלִין) with future sense.—TR.]

[5] [Ver. 7. Sept.: "and know thou that," *etc.*, reading probably דְּעָה לְּךָ for רָעָה לְךָ; but it had the latter reading also.—Instead of עַד־עַתָּה some VSS., EDD. and MSS. have וְעַד־עַתָּה, which would not, however, alter the translation. The ו in this case merely carries on the sequence of time up to the limit, and is not to be rendered "even" (as if emphatic), as Eng. A. V. often does.—TR.]

[6] [Ver. 8. So Thenius, Wellhausen, *Bib.-Com.*, Erdmann.—TR.]

10 now he is fled out of the land for [from[7]] Absalom. And Absalom, whom we
anointed over us, is dead in battle. Now, therefore [And now], why speak ye not
a word of bringing the king back[8]?

11 And king David sent to Zadok and to Abiathar the priests, saying, Speak unto
the elders of Judah, saying, Why are ye [will ye be] the last to bring the king
back to his house? seeing the speech of all Israel is come to the king *even* [*om.*
12 even] to his house.[8] Ye are my brethren, ye are my bones [bone] and my flesh;
wherefore, then are ye [and why will ye be] the last to bring back the king?
13 And say ye to Amasa, Art thou not of [*om.* of] my bone and of [*om.* of] my flesh?
God do so to me and more also, if thou be not captain of the host before me con-
14 tinually in the room [instead] of Joab. And he bowed [inclined] the heart of all
the men of Judah even [*om.* even] as the *the heart* of one man; so that [and] they
sent *this word* unto the king, Return thou, and all thy servants.

III. *David's Passage over the Jordan under the Escort of the Men of Judah, with Three Incidents.* Vers. 15–40 *a* [Heb. 16–41 *a*].

1. Pardoning of Shimei. Vers. 15–23 [Heb. 16–24].

15 So [And] the king returned, and came to [*ins.* the] Jordan. And Judah came
to Gilgal, to go[9] to meet the king, to conduct the king over [*ins.* the] Jordan.
16 And[10] Shimei, the son of Gera, a [the] Benjamite [Benjaminite], which was of
17 Bahurim, hasted and came down with the men of Judah to meet king David, And
there were [*om.* there were] a thousand men of Benjamin with him, and Ziba the
servant of the house of Saul, and his fifteen sons and his twenty servants with him;
18 and they went over [*ins.* the] Jordan before the king. And there went over a
ferry-boat [And the ferry-boat went over] to carry over the king's household, and
to do what he thought good. And Shimei the son of Gera fell down before the
19 king as he was come over [*ins.* the] Jordan; And said unto the king, Let not my
lord impute iniquity unto me, neither do thou remember [and remember not] that
which thy servant did perversely the day that my lord the king went out of Jeru-
20 salem, that the king should take it to his heart. For thy servant doth know that
I have sinned; therefore [and] behold, I am come the first this day of all the

[7] [Ver. 9. מֵעַל is rendered by Gesenius: "from on," as conveying the notion that David had been a burden on Absalom; but it also sometimes — "from the presence of," as in Gen. xvii. 22. There is not sufficient ground, therefore, for Böttcher's remark that the phrase is not Hebrew, and should at least be מִפְּנֵי, or for regarding the מֵעַל as the remnant of an original וּמִמַּמְלַכְתּוֹ, "and from his kingdom" (Sept.), which may be merely a marginal explanation. Syr.: "come now, let us flee from the land from after Absalom," reading נִבְרַח.—Tr.]

[8] [Vers. 10, 11. The expression: "to his house," at the end of ver. 11 is here inappropriate; for the talk among the people had certainly not come to the king's house (*i. e.* dwelling, as the context shows); it was perhaps repeated from the previous clause after the הַמֶּלֶךְ. Moreover this last clause seems to be better put at the end of ver. 10; it sounds more like the statement of the narrator than like a part of the king's speech to Judah. In ver. 10 it may have fallen out by similar ending, two successive clauses there ending in הַמֶּלֶךְ. See Erdmann's remarks in the Exposition.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 15. Instead of לָלֶכֶת some ancient EDD. and MSS. have לָרֶדֶת, "to descend;" but the weight of authority is on the side of the text.—The Hiph. Inf. with Prep. is in this verse written לְהַעֲבִיר, in ver. 18 (Heb. 19) לַעֲבִיר.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 16 sqq. Wellhausen regards the statement about Ziba as a sort of parenthesis (ver. 18 *b* being connected with ver. 16), and makes some changes in the text: he omits the וְ before צָלְחוּ, and at the beginning of ver. 18 (Heb. 19) reads עָבְרוּ (so Vulg.; Syr. עברו), instead of עָבְרָה. The account would then read: "And Shimei, *etc.*, came to meet David, and one thousand Benjaminites with him. And Ziba, *etc.*, pressed (צָלְחוּ) to the Jordan *before* the king, and crossed (עָבְרוּ) the ford, *etc.* And Shimei fell down," *etc.* The reading of Vulg. at beginning of ver. 18: "and they crossed the ford," commends itself as appropriate, for we should not expect the statement about the ferry-boat to be inserted in the middle of the account of Sheba. But there seems to be no good ground for omitting the וְ before צָלְחוּ and thus confining this action to Ziba and his party. Shimei (with whom Ziba was) may have managed the arrangements for the transportation of the king's household. Ziba may have assisted; but it is not necessary to suppose that it was out of gratitude for this service that David made the decision in ver. 29 (Heb. 30).—Tr.]

21 house of Joseph to go [come] down to meet my lord the king. But [And] Abi-
shai the son of Zeruiah answered, and said, Shall not Shimei be put to death for
22 this, because he cursed the Lord's [Jehovah's] anointed? And David said, What
have I to do with you, ye sons of Zeruiah [*ins.* ?] that ye should [for ye will] this
day be adversaries unto me? [*om.* ?] shall there any man be put to death this day
23 in Israel? for do I not know that I am this day king over Israel? Therefore
[And] the king said unto Shimei, Thou shalt not die. And the king sware unto
him.

2. Mephibosheth's Apology. Vers. 24-30 [Heb. 25-31].

24 And Mephibosheth the son of Saul came down to meet the king, and had neither
dressed his feet,[11] nor trimmed his beard, nor washed his clothes, from the day the
25 king departed until the day he came *again* in peace. And it came to pass, when
he was come to [*better* from] Jerusalem to meet the king, that the king said unto
26 him, Wherefore wentest thou not with me, Mephibosheth? And he answered
[said], My lord, O king, my servant deceived me; for thy servant said, I will sad-
dle me an [the] ass, that I may [and] ride thereon, and go to[12] the king, because
thy servant is lame. And he hath slandered thy servant unto my lord the king.
27 But my lord the king is as an angel of God; do, therefore, what is good in thine
28 eyes. For, all of my father's house were but dead men before my lord the king;
yet didst thou [and thou didst] set thy servant among them that did eat at thine
own table; what right, therefore, [and what right] have I yet to cry any more
29 unto the king? And the king said unto him, Why speakest thou any more of thy
30 matter? I have said [I say], Thou and Ziba divide the land. And Mephibosheth
said unto the king, Yea, let him take all [Let him also take all] forasmuch
as [after] my lord the king is come again [*om.* again] in peace unto his own
house.

3. Barzillai's Greeting and Blessing. Vers. 31-40 *a* [Heb. 32-41 *a*].

31 And Barzillai the Gileadite came down from Rogelim, and went over [*ins.* the]
32 Jordan with the king, to conduct him over [*ins.* the] Jordan.[13] Now [And] Bar-
zillai was a very aged man, *even* [*om.* even] fourscore years old; and he had pro-
vided the king of sustenance while he lay[14] at Mahanaim; for he was a very great
33 man. And the king said unto Barzillai, Come thou over with me, and I will feed
34 thee with me in Jerusalem. And Barzillai said unto the king, How long have I
to live [How many are the days of the years of my life] that I should go up with
35 the king to Jerusalem? I am this day fourscore years old; *and* [*om.* and] can I
discern between good and evil? can thy servant taste what I eat or [and] what I
drink? can I hear any more the voice of singing men and singing women? where-
fore then [and why] should thy servant be yet a burden unto my lord the king?
36 Thy servant will go a little way over [*ins.* the] Jordan[15] with the king; and why
37 should the king recompense it me with such a reward [do me this favor[16]]? Let

[11] [Ver. 24. The two verbs in the Sept. ἐθεράπευσε and ὠνυχίσατο may be two renderings of the same Heb. word (Wellh.). As Wellhausen remarks, to express both verbs, the Heb. would use the expression: "he did not dress the nails (צִפָּרְנֵי) of his hands and of his feet," which hardly stood in our text.—Other points in the account of Mephibosheth are referred to by Erdmann in the Exposition.—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 26. Instead of אֶת some very good EDD. and MSS. have אֶל, which is a more natural reading, but is unsupported by ancient versions.—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 31. The אֶת is omitted in some EDD. and MSS.; others have the Qeri.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 32. בְּשִׁיבָתוֹ. The ancient versions and a few Heb. MSS. have the Infin. בְּשִׁבְתּוֹ, which is the usual construction. Another reading given by De Rossi from some MSS. is בְּשֵׂיבָתוֹ, "in his old age," which he thinks gives a good sense, but which will hardly commend itself.—Tr.]

[15] [Ver. 36. Wellhausen unnecessarily regards the words "the Jordan" as an addition to the text, on the ground that the expression: "I will go a little way over the Jordan," is inappropriate, and that it was clearly not Barzillai's purpose to cross the river. But he may well have desired to do the king the honor of escorting him across the boundary-line, the river, while he would not attach himself to the court by entering Jerusalem.—Tr.]

[16] [Ver. 36. The verb גָּמַל means in general: "to perform an act towards one," whether of good or of evil. The context here indicates that it is a favor that is done: but the idea of reward, which is not properly contained in the word, is here better omitted in the courtly speech of Barzillai.—Tr.]

thy servant, I pray thee, turn back again [return], that I may die in mine own
city *and be buried* [*om.* and be buried] by the grave of my father and of my
mother. But behold thy servant Chimham, let him go over [let thy servant Chim-
ham go over] with my lord the king; and do to him what shall seem good unto
38 thee. And the king answered [said], Chimham shall go over with me, and I will
do to him that which shall seem good unto thee; and whatsoever thou shalt require
of me, *that* will I do for thee. And all the people went over [*ins.* the] Jordan.
39 And when the king was come over, the king kissed Barzillai, and blessed him;
40 and he returned unto his own place. Then [And] the king went on to Gilgal,
and Chimham went on with him.

17 [Ver. 40. The Heb. has "Chimhan," which Böttch (though with scarcely any ground) regards as a Judaised form of the native name "Chimham." There may have been different pronunciations of proper names (there are signs of this elsewhere in the Old Testament), or this different writing may be a scribal inadvertence (the difference is not retained in the ancient versions), proper names being especially liable to corruption.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

I. Vers. 1–8. *David's immoderate grief for Absalom stopped by Joab's earnest representations.*—Ver. 1. **And it was told Joab**, comp. xviii. 33. The purpose of the informant, it seems, was to explain to Joab and the army why the king did not come forth to greet his returning victorious warriors. [Joab had apparently just returned from the field of battle.—Tr.].—Vers. 2, 3. Touching description of the impression made on the people by David's violent grief, and their quiet and repressed behaviour. **The deliverance** that was achieved by the victory changed into **mourning for the whole people.**—The news spread everywhere ("the people heard that it was said"): "The king mourns for his son." But these men's *hearty participation in the sorrow of the beloved king*, for whom they had perilled their lives, soon changed to *gloomy dissatisfaction* at the fact that the king, absorbed in his private grief, did not deign to bestow a look on them. The description of the manner in which the troops, thus dissatisfied, returned to the city, is psychologically very fine. **They stole away** to enter the city, *i. e.*, *not:* avoided entering the city (Vulgate, Luther, Mich., Niemeyer), *but*, instead of entering in military order as a victorious host, scattered and entered individually or in small groups, unobserved, **as people steal in that have disgraced themselves by fleeing in battle**, as disgraced fugitives. Mourning, therefore, instead of joy of victory, seeming shame instead of honor.—Ver. 4. Continued violent grief of David, who, overmastered by his feelings, forgets what he owes not only to the army, but also to his people and his royal position. "Certainly the army, which had perilled goods and life to win the fugitive king back his kingdom, is very much concerned at his immoderate affliction, and Joab, who was doubtless conscious of having acted with a proper apprehension of the public situation, takes the liberty by an earnest word to remind the king of his governmental duty" (Baumgarten). [The king *covered his face*, a sign of extreme grief or shame; comp. Isa. liii. 3: "he was as one hiding his face from us." He cried, *with a loud voice*, according to the open and violent mode of expressing grief common in the East (and so also the heroes of the Iliad); there are striking illustrations of this in the Arabian Nights.—Tr.].—Vers. 5–7. *Joab's representations* to David, and first, *accusatory reproof* (vers. 5, 6), which is only partially just (ver. 5). David had certainly, contrary to his duty as *king* and *commander-in-chief* of the army, done what Joab reproaches him with in the words: **Thou hast to-day shamed the faces of all thy servants,**= "Thou hast destroyed the hopes (thy army's of *praise*, thy nearest friends' of *joy*)" (Thenius). It behooved the king to give the victorious army a reception in keeping with the victory. **Who have saved thy life and the life of all thine**, for this they put their lives at stake. [If Absalom had conquered, David and his whole household would probably have been slain, such being the Oriental custom.—Tr.].—But Joab's reproof goes on to what is partially untrue, ver. 6: **in that thou lovest them that hate thee,** *etc.* This was true, certainly, for Absalom, who was his father's enemy, was now the object of his father's love; but it was a bitter untruth when Joab added: **and hatest them that love thee**; David had not deserved such a misapprehension of his heart and disposition, though his conduct had given occasion to it. **That leaders and servants are not for thee**, that is, *not:* that they are nothing (worth nothing) to thee (De Wette, Keil), *but:* are for thee as if they do not exist; Vulg.: "because thou carest not for thy leaders." **I perceive to day that, if* Absalom lived, and we were all dead today, then.**—As Absalom, if he had conquered, would certainly have slain with his father all his household also (ver. 5), so, says Joab, if Absalom had lived (as David in his lamentation desired) and he himself (Joab) had been slain in his place, David's whole army would have shared in his destruction. Joab dissects David's words of lamentation with inexorable cruelty, and draws thence with his intellectual acuteness and the grim bitterness of his rude nature consequences that are seemingly logical, yet lay far from David's nature, though his conduct looked like what he was reproached with.—Happily, Joab's speech—which bears the stamp of military rudeness, disappointed ambition, cruel hard-heartedness and bitter resentment, and finds its justification only in the fact that it set aside David's weak grief—softens in the following words (ver. 7), wherein he earnestly presses *good counsel* on David, and

* Instead of לא read לֻא — לוּ.

thus deserves well of him and the people. **Arise, go forth**, tear thyself from the grief in which thou art lost. **Speak to the heart of thy servants** (Homer's καταθύμια [comp. Eng. *encourage*]), in friendly fashion, satisfy and refresh their minds; so the Vulg. (comp. Gen. xxxiv. 3; l. 21 and many other passages). The meaning is not: "speak of their heart," *i. e.*, their courage = praise them for their bravery (Jos.), which is against the usual signification of the words. **I swear, if thou go not forth** . . . Joab does not threaten that *he* will lead the army away [Josephus], but he describes the indubitable result of the dissatisfaction in the army: it will not stay. Thus he points out what consequences David's behaviour will have for his throne. **Worse than all the evil**, Joab rightly says, that would be; for by abandonment to grief he would give up the kingdom that God had a second time bestowed on him. Clericus: "He intimates that the troops would abandon David, who, from silly weakness and foolish love of Absalom, acted as if he were angry with the victorious army, and elect another king."—Ver. 8. The *effect* of Joab's sharp words was that David shook off his grief, and seated himself in the gate.* The news goes quickly through the people. **All the people came before the king**, who, in accordance with Joab's counsel, expressed to them his thanks and his kind feeling. Thus was the danger to David's throne from the spirit of disintegration (which, as the succeeding history shows, continued after the victory) set aside by Joab's sharp and bitter word, which David took patiently, because he was obliged to acknowledge its justness.

II. Vers. 9–14. *Negotiations for David's return*. The last part of ver. 8 must be combined with ver. 9 into one sentence: **And when Israel had fled, every man to his tent** (comp. xix. 19) **all the people strove together in all the tribes of Israel.**—It is the *other* tribes, *excepting Judah*, that are meant. Among them, after their terrible defeat, the revolutionary excitement had soon passed away, and by this victory, whereby the land was saved from grievous misfortune, men's minds were turned to David, as they recalled his heroic deeds at home and abroad. **All the people strove together**, reproaching one another with delay in bringing back the king. **Why do ye keep quiet about bringing back the king?**—The people are reassembled after their dispersion; their representatives consult together zealously about the restoration to the throne, to which they had raised the insurgent Absalom by the act of anointing. They reproach one another for doing nothing to restore the king. In their *hearts*, therefore, they *feel* the grievous wrong they have done an anointed of the Lord, as is shown indirectly by their *words*, in which David's great deeds and the misfortunes of the terrible time just past are mentioned; and now they prepare for the *deed* of solemnly going to meet David, whereby they will declare that their hearts have returned to him in the old love and fidelity.—In ver. 9 after the word "land," the Sept. adds: "and from his kingdom and," meant doubtless as an explanatory statement.—At the end of ver. 10 [Heb. 11] the Sept., Vulg. (some MSS.) and Syriac have: "and the word of all Israel came to the king," which occurs in the Heb. at the end of ver. 11 [Heb. 12], and is there repeated by the versions [except Syr.—Tr.] only the "to his house" is not added in ver. 10. If these words belonged at the end of ver. 10, they would assign the motive of David's message in ver. 11 (Then., Böttch., Ew.); but we must hold (with Keil) that the difficulty that was found in them in ver. 11 (as an explanatory sentence) occasioned their insertion in ver. 10 as the ground of David's message in ver. 11.*—Ver. 11. David sent, not "the two high-priests Zadok and Abiathar to the elders" (Ewald), but a message *to* these two priests, who had remained in Jerusalem (xv. 27), to say to the elders: **Why will ye be the last to bring the king back to his house?** The rest of the verse declares that David's message was occasioned by information of the procedures in the other tribes.*—Ver. 12. **My brethren are ye, my bone and my flesh are ye**, that is, my nearest kindred, and the sharers of my name. The backwardness of Judah in the movement to restore David is explained by the fact that the insurrection started in Judah, and Absalom was first recognized as king in Jerusalem. Cornelius a Lapide: "Conscious that they had offended David, and fearing Absalom's garrison in Zion, they did not dare to recall him."—Ver. 13. David sends to *Amasa*, Absalom's general (xvii. 25), referring to their relationship (1 Chr. ii. 16, 17), and promises him with solemn oath the chief command of the army in place of Joab. Ewald well says that this "was not only a wise and politic act, but strictly considered no injustice to Joab, who, long notorious by his military roughness, had now shown such disobedience to the royal command in the case of Absalom, as could not be pardoned without offence to the king's dignity."—Ver. 14. **And he inclined**, that is, David (who is the subject in the preceding verse), not Amasa or one of the priests. It is conjectured by Thenius, and regarded as certain by Böttcher, that a passage has fallen out before ver. 14, because otherwise there is no mention of the carrying out of David's instructions and the effect of the promise to Amasa, whereby the change in Judah was produced; but such an insertion is not indicated in any of the ancient versions, and is not required by the connection.—After telling what David did in order to rouse his own tribe in consequence of the information received from the other tribes, the narrative states briefly that his wise procedure was crowned with complete success. He turned to him **the heart of all the men of Judah as that of one man.** With one accord they answered that they awaited his return, and made arrangements to bring him solemnly back. ["David was sagacious enough to see that to go back to his own people by force had its dangers, and that to wait long for a universal invitation had equal dangers. His own tribe ought to be foremost in welcoming him home, but they had rebelled with Absalom. He resolved at once to reassure them of his favor, and . . . . even to make some concession to them.

* [The gate was the place of assembly and business. See Ruth iv. 1, 2; 2 Kings vii. 2; Job xxix. 7.—Tr.]

* [See "Text. and Gram." In any case the words: "to his house" at the end of ver. 11 (Heb. 12) seem out of place.—Tr.]

. . . . This master-stroke of policy and of magnanimity was successful. The hearts of the people melted as one heart. It was the old David of Engedi and Ziklag. They sent a prompt invitation to him" (Knox, *David, the King*, pp. 377, 378).—Throughout this narrative the tribal feeling, which never wholly disappeared, is apparent; see ver. 12; xx. 4; xvi. 8.—Tr.]

III. Vers. 15–40. *David's return over the Jordan under the escort of the men of Judah.* Ver. 15. **The king returned**, namely, from Mahanaim with his army and all his retinue, **and came to the Jordan**, comp. xvii. 22; what a contrast to his situation when he went over the Jordan as a fugitive! On the other side **Judah came to Gilgal**, which (lying west of the Jordan-valley, below Jericho) was the rendezvous for the men that were solemnly to conduct David across the river from his position on the eastern bank. Thus is clearly given the *scene* of the following three *incidents* of the transit.

1. Vers. 16–24. *Shimei's meeting with David, and his pardon.*

Ver. 16. *Shimei*—of Bahurim, comp. xvi. 5 sq., 1 Kings ii. 8 sq.—"came down" from the mountainous table-land into the Jordan-valley, having joined the men of *Judah* as they advanced to Gilgal to meet the king.—Ver. 17. **The thousand Benjaminites with him** (who had, therefore, joined the procession of the Judahites) show the consideration he enjoyed in the tribe of Benjamin, and testified that a change had taken place in the former hostile feeling in this tribe towards David (comp. ver. 21). He brought this large band in order to do greater honor to the king (S. Schmid). Among the Benjaminites, Ziba (who, at David's flight, had acted a part so injurious to Mephibosheth) is specially mentioned, because he, with Shimei, represented the former adherents of Saul's house. He came with his fifteen sons and twenty servants probably with a bad conscience, in order to ward off betimes the effect of Mephibosheth's counter-statements. For Shimei and Ziba, with their attendants, show themselves very *quick and eager* to come to the king, who was still on the eastern bank of the river; *not:* "they went over" (Then. [Eng. A. V.]), nor: "came prosperously to" (S. Schmid), but: "they went quickly (pressed)* over the Jordan," just as they had hastened down into the valley; and they did this **in the presence of the king**,† who, they meant, should learn their zeal from their haste.—Ver. 18. Meantime, *the ferry-boat*, appointed to carry over the king's *household*, was in motion. While this was going on, Shimei fell down before the king, **as he** (Shimei) **was come over the Jordan**; the prostration was synchronous‡ with the completion of the transit. David cannot be the subject [of the verb "was come over"], as Keil and Bunsen suppose, for then, either it must read: "as he was purposing to go over," which is *grammatically* inadmissible, or: "when he had gone over," which would not be according to the *fact*, since the king was still on the left [eastern] bank, and did not cross till *after* these incidents, comp. vers. 40, 41.—Ver. 19. The *iniquity* for which Shimei asks *pardon* is his curse (xvi. 5 sq.); he begs the king not to remember it, to forgive and *forget*, not to take it into his heart and keep it there (the translation of Keil and De Wette: "that the king should take note of it" is too weak); not to make it the object of *memory* and *thought*.—Ver. 20. The *ground* of his request, namely, the *confession:* **I acknowledge my sin**, and the substantial proof of his penitence: **I am come the first of the house of Joseph.** Böttcher and Thenius, from the reading of the Sept.: "of all Israel and of the house of Joseph," adopt "of all the house of Israel" as the true text, regarding the "Joseph" as the insertion of a later hand, in the time of the divided kingdom, when Israel and Judah were distinguished from one another. But not only do we find (Keil) in Solomon's time the "house of Joseph" used as equivalent to the "ten tribes" (1 Kings xi. 28), but in Ps. lxxviii. 67, 68 (which belongs to David's time) we have the contrast between the tent of Joseph and the tribe of Ephraim on the one side (as rejected by God), and the tribe of Judah on the other (as chosen by God). "The designation of the tribes opposed to Judah by the name of the principal tribe *Joseph* (Josh. xvi. 1) is as old as the jealousy of these tribes towards Judah, which did not begin with the division of the kingdom, but was only thereby permanently confirmed" (Keil). [As Shimei was a Benjaminite, it would seem that the "house of Joseph" here is equivalent to "Israel" (the ten tribes). It is commonly supposed that this designation points to the time of the divided kingdom, and thus so far fixes the date of authorship of this passage (unless Böttcher's emendation of text, above-stated, be adopted). Erdmann's examples do not show that the designation was in use earlier than the division of the kingdom; for the Book of Kings belongs to the time of the Exile, and Ps. lxxviii. was probably written after Solomon's time (comp. the tone of ver. 1). Still it is quite possible that, with the old tribal feeling coming down from the time of the Judges (when there was probably a double hegemony of Judah and Ephraim), Shimei may have used this phrase, which, therefore, cannot be held to be perfectly decisive of the date of authorship. *Bible-Commentary* suggests that he employed it in order to exculpate his own tribe by intimating that it was drawn away by the preponderating influence of the great house of Joseph.—Tr.] Whether Shimei's request for forgiveness was a sign of sincere repentance, must be left undetermined; it may be doubted, when one reflects on his precipitation in seeking to be the *first* to do homage to David, and on the fact that his somewhat passionate cry for mercy coincided exactly with the happy turn in David's fortunes. Certainly he desired, now that David had regained power, to secure his forfeited life and avoid punishment.—Ver. 21. *Abishai* storms out against Shi-

---

* צָלַח, "to go over a thing," with עַל, אֶל and Acc.; Sept.: *κατεύθυναν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην*; Vulg.: *et irrumpentes Jordanem transierunt.*

† [Others render: "to meet the king;" more exactly: "into the presence of the king."—Tr.]

‡ This is shown by the בְּ in בְּעָבְרוֹ.—[The phrase: "in his crossing over" means "during the general fact of crossing." and may very well here apply to David. While the crossing was going on (the statements of time are quite general and loose) Shimei fell down, *etc.* For remarks on the arrangement of these verses (15-19) see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

mei (as in xvi. 9), doubting the genuineness of his penitence, and demands his death.—Ver. 22. David refuses, as in xvi. 10 sq. Though Abishai (in Joab's name also, for David addresses the "sons of Zeruiah") rightly characterizes Shimei's offence as cursing the "Lord's Anointed," for which he deserved death (Ex. xxii. 27; Lev. xxiv. 14 sq.; 2 Kings xxi. 10), David will *this day* not employ the *rigor of the law*. "Ye will be to me an *adversary*," literally, a *satan* (so Numb. xxii. 22, comp. Matt. xvi. 23), not a "peace-destroyer" (Bunsen), or "tempter" (Ewald). He says: "you will be a hindrance to me in the way of joy that I go to-day." Clericus: "to injure me by your ill-timed severity." He lays stress on the *to-day*. "Should any one be put to death *today* in Israel? for, do I not know that *to-day* I am become king over Israel?" David will show mercy, not because he is now become king and has the *right* to pardon, but because he sees in his restoration to his kingdom a proof of restoration to the divine *favor*, and by showing favor to Shimei as his right will fulfil the *obligation* of gratitude to the Lord.—Ver. 23. David's oath to spare Shimei shows that his mercy was occasioned by his present experience of the divine mercy. But his injunction to Solomon (1 Kings ii. 8 sq.) to punish Shimei for his reviling contradicts this promise. This contradiction is not removed by saying that Shimei was not promised immunity in the following reign (Hess), nor by the observation that he was a dangerous man capable of repeating under Solomon what he had done under David. David now pardoned Shimei, chiefly, no doubt, for political reasons, in order not to disturb the favorable feeling of the people, especially of Benjamin.*

2. Vers. 24–30. *Mephibosheth's apology*.—Ver. 24. Comp. ix. 6. He "came down" from Jerusalem to the Jordan. **His feet and his beard he had not made**; the word *make* [= "dress"] (Deut. xxi. 12) is so used in German also [comp. similar use of *do* in English.—Tr.]. The addition of the Sept.: "nor cut his nails," is merely explanatory (Bunsen), and is not to be put into the text. He had not washed his feet or dressed his beard†—thus he had *mourned* for David; in these signs of deep grief comp. Ezek. xxiv. 17. This was a sign of his sincere, faithful attachment to the house of David, not a sign (Buns., Ewald) that his hopes had not been fulfilled in connection with the new government [Absalom's].—Ver. 25. **As now Jerusalem came‡ to meet the king.**—*Jerusalem* here stands for its inhabitants or their representatives; this is often the case, and the expression here cannot be called "strange." The rendering of the Arabic: "and when he came from Jerusalem" introduces a repetition, Mephibosheth's coming having been already stated [ver. 24]; it is therefore the less warrantable (with Thenius) to change the text on the sole authority of this version. The translation: "when Mephibosheth came to Jerusalem to meet the king" (Sept., Luther, Michaelis, Maur.) contradicts the "came down" of ver. 24, and the whole connection from which it appears that during this conversation David was still at the Jordan. [This rendering of Erdmann's is improbable, 1) because it has already been stated that *Judah* had come to meet the king (ver. 15), and 2) because it does not appear why the coming of the Jerusalemites should be the occasion of David's addressing Mephibosheth.—The rendering "to Jerusalem" (as in Eng. A. V.) would change the scene abruptly and without connection. It is easier to read "from Jerusalem," which makes good sense, and agrees with the context. It is not a mere repetition of the "came down" of ver. 24, since the fact is here added that he came from Jerusalem. It may be, however, that, while he set out and came down to meet the king, the meeting did not actually occur till the latter had advanced on his march as far as Jerusalem.—Tr.]—David's question: **Why wentest thou not with me?** presupposes the impression made on him by Ziba's words (xvi. 3), and also contains a reproof.—Ver. 26. Mephibosheth's answer: **my servant deceived me,** injured me by *lies*, *deceived* me (Böttcher); this is the common meaning of the word (Gen. xxix. 25; Josh. ix. 22; 1 Sam. xix. 17; xxviii. 12; 1 Chr. xii. 17). The ground of this assertion: **For thy servant** (= I) **said** (not "thought," as most expositors render, for it appears from what follows that Mephibosheth had given an order that Ziba did not execute), **I will have the ass saddled and ride thereon and go to the king.**—Certainly the *lame* prince could not have thought of going himself to saddle the ass, an objection that Thenius urges against the text as he renders it: "and I thought, I will saddle me the ass." He then adopts the text of the ancient versions (except Chaldee): "Thy servant had said to him: saddle me the ass." But this change of text is unnecessary; the renderings of the versions are merely explanations. How often in all languages the expression "to do a thing" = "to have it done" (this very verb is so used in Gen. xxii. 3)! To refuse to translate: "I will *cause* to be saddled" is merely to make a difficulty where none exists. The phrase: "I *said:* I will" characterizes the circumstantialness of the narrative. [According to Mephibosheth's statement, then, Ziba, instead of obeying his master's order, had carried off animals and provisions, and used them in his own interests.—Tr.].—Ver. 27. **And he slandered thy servant.**—No sentence has fallen out before these words, explaining (Böttcher) how Mephibosheth was deceived by his servant. "It is already involved in the word 'deceived' that Ziba had not obeyed the order" (Thenius). Mephibosheth had heard of Ziba's slander (xvi. 3), and found it confirmed by the execution of David's order that all the property should belong to Ziba. David's reproachful question was a new confirmation of what he already knew. There is no trace here of "a confused way of defending himself" (Bunsen); his curt, summary mode of expression is explained by his excitement and by the situation of David who, occupied with his

* [David's charge to Solomon (1 Kings ii. 8, 9) is defended as the act of a prudent ruler, or as that of a righteous theocratic judge; but on neither ground can it be seen why he should break his promise. Perhaps, if we knew the circumstances more fully, there would be some explanation; at present we can only say that David's conduct was wrong, like many other acts of his. —Tr.]

† [Literally his "lip-beard," moustache (and perhaps the beard at the lower lip), Sept. *μύστακα*, Chald. "lip-beard."—Tr.]

‡ בָּא, masc., referring to the inhabitants. On this gender *ad sensum* see Ew. § 318 *a*.

transit and the solemn escort of the people, had no time to listen to a long narrative. Mephibosheth's statements were sufficient to establish his innocence, and to show how Ziba had deceived and slandered him.—My lord the king is **as the angel of God** (comp. xiv. 17) to know what is truth and right.—Ver. 28. Mephibosheth refers to David's former kindness and commits to him his fate, remarking that, though innocent, he could not rightfully demand anything, since he was a member of Saul's house, all of whom were "only dead men for the king," that is, all, himself included, might have been slain; being thus *without rights*, he could not *complain* or *ask for help* against the wrong done him.

Ver. 29. **And the king said to him: Why speakest thou further of thy affairs?**—This means: there is no need of further excuse on thy part (Thenius), but also expresses displeasure at Ziba, whose deception David now saw through. Wrongly Bunsen: "David saw through the complainant [Mephibosheth], and, wishing him well, made no further investigation." David is convinced of Mephibosheth's innocence. But the words: **I say** (= I decide) **thou and Ziba shall divide the land,** are only a *half*-exculpation of the poor, innocent man. For they do not "in any case" (Buns.) contain the confirmation of his first arrangement (ix. 7–10) and the retraction of his hasty decision in xvi. 4, as if he meant to say: Everything remains as I ordered at first (Then.). The statement is simply: *Divide* the land between you, that is, Ziba and his sons (to whom David in xvi. 4 gives all) are now to possess a part of the property; neither is the decision of chap. xvi. 4 entirely set aside, nor that of chap. ix. 7–10, whereby Mephibosheth was made *sole* possessor, re-established. Thenius thinks that the original arrangement (ix. 7–10) is here restored, "in so far, namely, as Ziba and his sons had of course lived on the produce of the estate;" but a servant's being maintained from the *produce* of the estate is a different thing from his being part-*owner*. David now sees the error of his decision in xvi. 4, and wishes publicly to recognize Mephibosheth's innocence, but not factually and expressly to acknowledge his own over-haste by completely revoking that decision; and so open wrong is done Mephibosheth, who gets only a *part* of the estate. David was herein probably controlled by political considerations, being unwilling to make the respectable and influential Ziba his enemy. That Ziba does not attempt to rebut Mephibosheth's statements proves his own guilt and the innocence of the latter.—Ver. 30. He said to the king: **Let him take all also.**—Cornelius a Lapide: "Mephibosheth seems to have said this, not from desire to insult David and murmur against God, but in the bitterness of his heart." The words express, not necessarily indeed resentment, but still Mephibosheth's feeling that wrong had been done him; at the same time he indicates that he is not concerned about property, but that his heart rather goes out to his king, who will show him again his former kindness. Let Ziba have all the land, I am only glad that my lord the king is come again in peace to his own house; as his guest, I do not need the land for my support. Mephibosheth could not more touchingly and unselfishly express his faithfulness to David. [David's feeling and motive in this procedure are not clear. If he thought Mephibosheth innocent, he was unjust towards him; if he thought the whole affair too uncertain to permit an absolute decision, he can hardly be defended against the charge of carelessness and precipitancy in making a decision. Perhaps he suspected the prince's fidelity, but thought it not worth while to push the investigation; he was tired of intrigues and conflicts. Opinions differ as to Mephibosheth's innocence, but the tone of his defence, the silence of Ziba, and the absence in the narrative (xv.–xviii.) of any hint of defection on his part, concur with his lameness in inclining us to absolve him from the charge of actual or intended rebellion.—Tr.]

3. Vers. 31–40. *Barzillai's greeting and blessing.*—Ver. 31. *Barzillai* (see xvii. 27) "came down" from the high region in which Rogelim in Gilead lay. **Went with David over the Jordan**—anticipatory statement of what did not take place till ver. 39, after the following conversation. **To conduct him** defines the statement in ver. 39; he intended to go with him only to the other side of the river, and then return.*—Ver. 32. **And he provided** (xvii. 27–29) for the king during his *long* stay, *abode*† in Mahanaim. He was a "very great" man, that is, rich, well thought of (Ex. xi. 3; Lev. xix. 15).—Ver. 33. The king said, Thou come over with me. The word "thou" is by its position emphatic, the king being chiefly concerned to take him along. **That I may provide for thee.**—The "provide" here answers to that in ver. 32. David wished to requite his kindness.—Ver. 34. With modest thanks Barzillai declines the king's invitation: 1) referring to the *shortness* of his remaining life. "How many days have I to live?" my life is too short to go to court. 2) Referring to his senile *weakness*, which unfitted him for court-life. Eighty years old, he says, he is *intellectually* too dull to be useful as a *counsellor* in distinguishing between *good* and *evil*. (For similar constructions see Lev. xxvii. 12; Jon. iv. 11; 1 Ki. iii. 9; Ezek. xliv. 23; Gen. xxvi. 28; Isaiah lix. 2).—But also his *bodily* senses, he says (taste and hearing), are too weak to enjoy the pleasures of court-life; 3) he objects that, being such a weak old man, he would be only a *burden* to the king.—Ver. 36. "For a short while," for

* This is the meaning of אֶת־בַּיַּרְדֵּן. If this Kethib be retained, אֶת is to be taken as sign of Acc. of space with an exacter definition by בְּ. So Ges. (Thes.): "that he might accompany him in crossing the river; the words אֶת־בַּיַּרְדֵּן designate the *bed* of the Jordan, and אֶת denotes the Acc. of place or space after a verb of going." So Maurer: "that he might accompany him τὸ (i. e., τὴν ὁδὸν = τὰς διαβάσεις) ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ," and Böttcher: אֶת־ = "*id quod*, to conduct him what (the piece of way) was in the Jordan (but not farther)." It does not appear how this explanation leads to the absurd statement (Then.) that the octogenarian Barzillai "went in the Jordan *alongside* of the ferry-boat," for the אֶת־בַּה׳ = "the in the Jordan," denotes the space that makes the *breadth* of the Jordan. The Qeri אֶת־הַ׳ is adopted by Thenius, who appeals to the Sept., Chald. and Arabic (holding that the Keth. comes from miswriting ב for ה), and renders: "to escort him *the Jordan*" [Acc.]; this gives the same sense, but is an attempt to lighten the certainly difficult Kethib.

† שִׁיבָה for יְשִׁיבָה (Maur., Böttch., Ew. § 153, 2 *b*).

the present moment, will thy servant go over Jordan with the king; his purpose, he says, was merely to escort the king across the river, as appears from the context, vers. 32, 37. The "short while" does not refer to the time he would have had to spend at court. [The word may also be rendered, as in Eng. A. V., "a little way."—TR.] "Why will the king requite me this requital or kindness?" namely, with reference to Barzillai's maintenance of the king (ver. 32).—Ver. 37. As the king might have *commanded* him to go with him, he *requests* permission to return home. He is done with life, and wishes to die by the grave of his father and mother. F. W. KRUMMACHER: "Can any thing be more amiable than these simple and sensible words? What a cheerful and peaceful spirit they breathe on us!"—But in his stead he offers the king *his son Chimham* (1 Kings ii. 7), not to ask a favor for him. but to put him into his service. The Syr., Arab. and Josephus add "my son" after "Chimham," which is a proper explanation, but not to be adopted into the text. In ver. 41 the name is written *Chimhan*—comp. Jer. xli. 17. [Jer. xli. 17 mentions a *geruth* or sojourning-place of Chemoham or or Chimham. Stanley (*Jewish Church*, II. 201) thinks that this was a caravanserai (it was on the south of Bethlehem) for travellers to Egypt, and the same in which Joseph and Mary found shelter (Luke ii. 7). The connection between the names is, however, not certain.—TR.]—Ver. 38. David receives Chimham, and promises Barzillai further to do all that he desires. "I will do whatever thou shalt choose [require] of (literally, *upon*) me," where the *upon* expresses David's sense of *obligation*. He does not here regard Barzillai as a suppliant for a favor. So Clericus. Comp. Judg. xix. 20.—Ver. 39. Not till after this conversation does the passage across the river take place; why it must have occurred during the conversation (Then., Keil) does not appear from the context; and the space of transit was not great enough for the length of the talk. It is not merely "almost" (Thenius), but, from the fresh and individual touches of the picture, quite certain that this is the account of one who himself heard the conversation. **And when the king was come over, he kissed Barzillai.**—That is, took leave of him, comp. Ruth i. 9. This shows that Barzillai merely intended to accompany the king over the Jordan, and not further.—Ver. 40. The king went on to *Gilgal*, a noted place in the history of Israel, and specially fitted by its position to be a rendezvous for large bodies of men; comp. Josh. iv. 19; v. 1–12; ix. 6; x. 6; xiv. 6; 1 Sam. vii. 16; x. 3; xi. 14, 15; xiii. 7–9.—**And Chimhan went on with him.**—Ewald's remark that "this account of Barzillai is given at so great length obviously because his son Chimham and his family were afterwards renowned in Jerusalem," impairs the inherent significance of this episode (taken in connection with xvii. 27–29) in David's life, which displays in the most vivid and beautiful way the *unchangeable fidelity* of this noble and influential Gileadite land-owner, as a representative of the transjordanic region, and the *grateful love and devotion* of the hard-proved but now once more highly favored king, who in Barzillai's love and faithfulness saw a proof of the divine grace and truth.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. *Right and wrong* are remarkably mingled in the conduct of David and Joab, and in the affair between them immediately after Absalom's death. While the *father's* grief for the lost *son* was altogether justifiable, the *king* by the immoderateness of his sorrow neglected his duty towards his *people*, through whom God had given him the victory; by his passionate grief, also, he disturbed the clearness of his *mental view*, and lamed his *manly strength*; and finally, absorbed in his loss, forgot to thank the Lord that He had avenged *the honor of His name* by the restoration of the *theocratic kingdom* to the well-being of the whole people; the whole kingdom of God in Israel, as the bearer and instrument of which he was chosen and called for the present and the future, disappears for him in the gloomy depth of grief, wherein he had buried himself with his feelings and thoughts.—F. W. Krummacher: "It is a reproach to him that he subordinated his kingly consciousness too much to his feelings as head of a family. In view of the general weal, he ought at least to have moderated his grief, given thanks to the Lord, and made acknowledgment of the faithful devotion of his brave soldiers." Over against this wrong *Joab* is altogether right in reminding the king of the danger of such a course, and reproving him with *severe* words. But the savage and bitter manner in which he approaches the king (though it was God's means of averting a great evil from David and the nation) is to be condemned. His undisciplined word became a means of discipline to David, and the king turned from the destructive path into which unbridled feeling had led him.

2. David's *situation* after his splendid victory was, in spite of the change of popular feeling in Israel, a *critical* one, on account of the hesitation of Judah, the most powerful tribe, and the real historical foundation of the theocratic kingdom, as it was founded in David. For the sins of its bearer, God had before men's eyes permitted this kingly structure, reared by His hand, to fall, in order to show that human sin must *obstruct* and *ruin* His cause, but to make manifest at the same time, that the maintenance of His kingdom is not dependent on human power and wisdom. The point now was the restoration of the ethical foundations of the theocratic kingdom, which were destroyed by the revolution first in the tribe of Judah, where the revolution began; this tribe must be brought back to its faithful obedience to David, its defection having been punished by the divine judgment on Absalom. Recognizing this, David showed discretion and wisdom in his negotiations with the elders, which had the desired result. He saw through the grounds of action of the other tribes, and perceived how dangerous it might be, if his own tribe Judah, his home and support, should be, as it were, conquered by the others, especially as the insurrection had found powerful aid among them. He therefore approached Judah with mildness. But he went beyond ordinary bounds in appointing the general of the insurrection, Amasa, his commander-in-chief in place of Joab, who had won

him the victory. This act of political shrewdness, brought back Judah to him as *one* man. Peter Martyr: "I would not altogether defend David in this, but I regard it as an arrangement of divine providence, which purposed through Amasa to turn Judah to David."

3. When Shimei meets David with confession of his fault, *Abishai* is the same hot-blooded zealot for David's royal honor as in xvi. 9, and is repulsed now, as then. He (with Joab, who was like him in character) is a type of fleshly zeal, as it is seen in the "Sons of Thunder," who would call down fire from heaven on the Samaritans. But, in contrast with the law which, regarding reviling the king as reviling God, punishes it with death, David, by sparing the reviler passes out of the sphere of the Old Testament into that of the New Testament. The decision as to Shimei's *sincerity* he leaves to God, but, in view of the Lord's pardoning mercy and goodness to himself, is led by the Spirit of the Lord to accept Shimei's actual confession, and pardon him. Thus he is the type of the merciful love of the New Testament kingdom of heaven in Christ, which blots out all guilt of sin on condition of true repentance; and he is also the type of forgiving love of enemies. He who has himself received forgiveness of sin from God, and can only praise God's mercy as the source of all that he is and has, will also forgive his neighbor his sins. The antitype of the forgiving David is the king of the New Testament kingdom of God. Matt. xviii. 23-25. David had accorded Shimei *mercy* by an *oath*, without reservation and *without* limitation to *his own* reign, as some hold against the sense of his words. His command to Solomon shortly before his death, to execute Shimei, is a falling back to the strictly legal standpoint, above which he had lifted himself here on the Jordan, and can be *explained* only from the fact that *David* distinguished between his own *personal interest and motive*, which led him to pardon Shimei, without taking the theocratic-legal standpoint, and *the theocratic interests of the kingdom*, of which Solomon was the representative, and so held himself bound on theocratic-political grounds, to commit to his successor the execution of the legal prescription, which he himself had passed over.

4. Half-way reparation of a hastily committed, and afterwards recognized wr[illegible] (as in David's conduct to Ziba and Meph[illegible]bth) is as great an injustice as complete neg[illegible] While he pardons the criminal Shimei, he gives the innocent Mephibosheth only half his rights, and the other half he gives to the unrepentant slanderer Ziba, without a word of reproof, evidently in order to avoid making enemies of Ziba's not uninfluential family in Benjamin. Peter Martyr: "David's acts are not only unjust, but self-contradictory; there he pardons a wicked man, here he oppresses a good man. Yet, though he sins so often, he does not abandon his faith; he is a weak man, but holds on to God's word."—Mephibosheth is an illustration of humility patiently bearing wrong. Peter Martyr: "Mephibosheth thought perhaps, of the word of the law, that God visits sins on children to the third and fourth generation."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Chap. xix. 1-8. *The sinfulness of unmeasured grief.* I. *Wherein it consists and manifests itself.* 1) *As regards the Lord*, in ignoring the gracious gifts which He sends us along with and amid our sufferings, and in frustrating His gracious design to purify us by suffering from all selfishness; 2) *As regards our neighbor*, in slighting and violating the duties of love that we owe him; 3) *As regards our own heart and conscience*, in reckoning the powers of spirit and will by exhausting emotion and enervating inactivity. II. *How it must be overcome:* 1) Through the word of earnest admonition, which gives pain; 2) By energetically rising up to new life and faithful discharge of the duties of our calling; 3) By accepting the consolation and strength which come from above through the Spirit of God.

Vers. 9-15. *What wins for a king his people's heart?* 1) Risking his life for their welfare in fighting against *external* foes; 2) Deeds of deliverance in the overthrow of *internal* foes; 3) Timely words of hearty, reconciling love, which anticipates and makes advances.

Vers. 16-40. *The righteousness of love*, showing itself in the fact that after the divine ordinance and after the example of divine righteousness it gives *to every one his own:* 1) As *forgiving* love, pardon to the enemy who confesses his wrong and begs forgiveness, vers. 16 sqq.; 2) As *rebuking* love, earnest admonition to the unloving zealot, vers. 21 sq.; 3) As *self-denying* love, which makes good the wrong done to our neighbor, and unreservedly restores him what belongs to him, vers. 24 sqq.; 4) As *thankful* love, ready every moment to requite to our neighbor by word and deed the benefits he has done us, vers. 31 sqq.

Barzillai the picture and example of a venerable and pious old age: 1) *Blessed* of *God*, it devotes the temporal goods it has received to the service of compassionate brotherly love, far from all *avarice;* 2) *Honored* by *men*, it desires not the vain honor of this world, far from all *ambition;* 3) *Near* the *grave*, it longs only for *home*, far from all disposition to find *blessedness in this life;* 4) *But as long as God grants life*, even with failing powers it still *serves* the Lord and His kingdom, and in this service honors him by the devotion even of its dearest—far from all *self-seeking.*—[SAURIN has a good sermon on Barzillai and Chimham, as suggesting and illustrating the fact that court life is in certain respects proper for the young and improper for the aged.—TR.]

FR. ARNDT: Vers. 9-40. *How David crowns his triumph*, and prepares for himself a new and delightful future. 1) By forgiveness of the *evil* that has been shown him, and 2) By thankfulness for the *good* that he had likewise received.

Vers. 1-8. When once a man has overcome his feelings of grief and gives himself up to fresh activity, then the struggle is soon over, the evil is wholly conquered, the fountain of suffering is thoroughly stopped, the sting of suffering broken; reconciled with past and present, there arises to us for the future a new life.—OSIANDER: God often so mingles joy and sorrow together, that the pious have in this world no *complete* joy,

in order that they may the more earnestly long after things eternal. Psa. xlii. 3 [2].—SCHLIER: Let us never forget modesty, but always with genuine respect say what is necessary. Yet when we do that, let us also freely utter the truth, and never keep back through fear of men or men-pleasing.—WUERT. B.: When men do wrong and are overhasty, we should indeed reprove them, but not unseasonably, nor with bitterness, envy, reviling, and too great violence. Psa. cxli. 5.—S. SCHMID: A man of sense must bear a slight evil in order that a greater may be averted. —SCHLIER: How many sore and bitter experiences we might spare ourselves, if we always made it our first wisdom to let ourselves be advised.

Vers. 9-14. [TAYLOR: David had been called to the throne at first by the choice of the people, as well as by the designation of Jehovah, and he would not move in the direction of resuming his regal dignity until, in some form or other, the desire of the tribes had been indicated to him.—TR.]—WUERT. BIBLE: Men do not commonly recognize the good while they possess it, but only afterwards, when they have lost it and would like to have it again.—[HENRY: Good services done to the public, though they may be forgotten for a while, yet will be remembered again when men come to their right minds.—TR.]—It is always better to be too gentle than too sharp; for a good word finds a good place, and gentleness wins hearts. Judg. viii. 3; xii. 3.—SCHLIER: Let us *also* remember our sins and more and more humble ourselves, then we shall also be mild and gentle toward friend and foe, and so receive the blessing promised to all the merciful.—BERL. B.: For such a God, whose goodness is as infinite as His power, it is not so hard to win hearts; He knows the true secret of winning them in the right way; because He knows how to touch them inwardly. Thus hast Thou, O love, inclined the heart of all believers as if it were only one man.

Vers. 15-23. [TAYLOR: In all this procedure David was not actuated by his usual sagacity; and the result of his apparent preference of Judah over the other tribes not only provoked another rebellion after his return to Jerusalem, but also prepared the way for the division of the kingdom, which took place in the days of his grandson, Rehoboam.—TR].—There is no true forgiveness till the thought of the offences is wholly effaced from the heart. Psa. xxv. 7.—STARKE: By honest confession and earnest repentance one may obtain mercy and forgiveness from men, how much more from the merciful God. James iv. 9, 19.—SCHLIER: God's mercy should open our hearts, should make us gentle and mild toward others; for the Lord's sake who has forgiven us, we should also forgive others.—BERL. B.: God cannot suffer such men as under the appearance of righteousness oppose His mercy. —[HENRY: David had severely revenged the abuses done to his ambassadors by the Ammonites (xii. 31), but easily passes by the abuse done to himself by an Israelite. That was an affront to Israel in general, and touched the honor of his crown and kingdom; this was purely personal, and therefore (according to the usual disposition of good men) he could the more easily forgive it. —SCOTT: Our best friends must be considered as adversaries, when they would persuade us to act contrary to our conscience and our duty. Matt. xvi. 21-23.—TR.]

Vers. 24-30. STARKE: For reviling and slander the first and chief occasion is given by selfishness and envy.—God does not let the truth remain always defeated, but causes it at the proper time to come to light.—SCHLIER: When a man does us good, we should remember him for it, and if sometimes wrong is done us, we will quickly forget the wrong, but the good that has befallen us we will not forget. A thankful man is sure to come to honor, even if in the meanwhile evil times do occasionally intervene; while ingratitude always comes to shame.—[Ver. 29. TAYLOR: Every one knows that when he has been entrapped into the doing of an ungenerous or unjust thing, there springs up in him an irritation at himself, which is apt to betray itself in hastiness of speech and manner quite similar to that here manifested by David. But both the temper and the decision were unworthy of David. —TR.]

Vers. 31-40. STARKE: Our gratitude to our neighbor should be shown not only by *words*, but also by the most devoted affection of the *heart*, and by *actions themselves*.—BERL. B.: That is an honorable old age, which dies to the lusts and vanities of the world, seeks peace and quiet, earnestly thinks of the end and prepares for death. —OSIANDER: If we cannot requite our benefactors in their life-time for their good deeds, we should at any rate make their posterity enjoy it.

[Vers. 7, 8. In a time of overwhelming calamity the *necessity* [illegible] exertion is often a great blessing.—Vers. [illegible] 10. The safety of popular institutions is in [illegible]*n*.—Vers. 16, 17. Among the sore trials of high station is the necessity of bearing with men who are grossly unworthy, but manage to command influence.—TR.]

IV. *Strife between Judah and Israel over bringing David back.* Chap. XIX. 40 *b*–43. [Heb. 41 *b*–44.]

40 And all the people of Judah conducted[1] the king [*ins.* over] and also half the
41 people of Israel; And behold, all the men of Israel came to the king, and said
unto the king, Why have our brethren the men of Judah stolen thee away, and
have brought the king, and his household, and all David's men with him, over
42 Jordan? And all the men of Judah answered the men of Israel, Because the
king is near *of kin* to us [is near to me]; wherefore then be ye [and why art thou]
angry for this matter? have we eaten at all of the king's *cost?* or hath he given us
43 any gift?[2] And the men of Israel answered the men of Judah, and said, We [I]
have ten parts in the king, and we have also more *right* in David than ye [and also
in David[3] I have more than thou]; why then did ye despise us [and why hast thou
despised me], that our [my] advice should not be [was not] first had in bringing
back our [my] king? And the words of the men of Judah were fiercer than the
words of the men of Israel.

V. *Sheba's insurrection and Israel's defection occasioned by this strife between Judah and Israel. Both quelled by Joab after his murder of Amasa.* Chap. XX. 1–22.

1 And there happened to be there a man of Belial [a wicked man], whose [and
his] name was Sheba, the son of Bichri, a Benjamite [Benjaminite]. And he blew
a [the] trumpet, and said, We have no part in David, neither have we [and we
2 have] no inheritance in the son of Jesse; every man to his tents,[4] O Israel. So
every man [And all the men] of Israel went up from after David, *and* followed
Sheba the son of Bichri; but the men of Judah clave unto their king, from Jordan
3 even [*om.* even] to Jerusalem. And David came to his house at Jerusalem; and
the king took the ten women *his* concubines, whom he had left to keep the house,
and put them in ward, and fed [maintained] them, but went not in unto them;
so [and] they were shut up unto the day of their death, living in widowhood [in
lifelong widowhood[5]].

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 40. Eng. A. V. here adopts the Qeri, so Erdmann, Vulg. This reading is supported by Sept., Syr., Arab., Chald., and by a number of Heb. MSS. and printed editions.—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 42. Böttcher and Erdmann: "has anything been taken by us?" The rendering of Eng. A. V. is that of the ancient versions, Gesen., Philippson, Cahen. In defence of it may be said that נָשָׂא occurs elsewhere as Piel (1 Kings ix. 11), and that the parallelism does not absolutely demand the Infin. Absol. in the second member. On the other hand, Böttcher's rendering of לְ as introducing the *agent* is strange.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 43. The masoretic text is here supported by all the ancient versions except Sept., which gives בְּכוֹר, πρωτότοκος, but this word would hardly be followed in Heb. by the comparative מִן—"I am first-born over thee;" it would be simply "I am the first-born" or, "I am older (זָקֵן) than thou." The material argument against the Sept. reading is given by Erdmann.—After מַדּוּעַ Böttcher inserts זֶה from the Sept. τοῦτο; but (as he says) this expression is not found elsewhere, and the frequency of the Sept. ἱνατί τοῦτο would account for it here without the supposition of a זֶה in the Hebrew.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 1. This verse is one of those cited among the "Corrections of the Scribes." The exact nature of the correction is not stated, but Tanchum states that in Chron. instead of לְאֹהָלָיו "to his tents" is written לֵאלֹהָיו "to his gods" (Buxtorf). Geiger (*Urschrift*, pp. 290, 315) adopts this latter reading, and sees in it a trace of ancient Israelitish idolatry, to conceal which, he thinks, our text has been changed. But, as our reading is fully supported externally and internally, there is as little ground for this as for most other changes proposed by Geiger.—Tr.]

[5] [Ver. 3. Böttcher and Erdmann (retaining the masoretic pointing): "in a widowhood during lifetime," that is, during the lifetime of the husband, which while it avoids a repetition is somewhat violent. The same sense is gotten by Wellhausen, who for חַיּוּת (which he thinks a doubtful form) writes חַיּוֹת, and renders: "living widows"—widows of a living husband, which is also hard. The phrase "widowhood of life" (as in the masoretic pointing) naturally means "lifelong widowhood," and so Ewald (Gesch. III. 262) understands it: "widows that could never be married again."—Tr.]

4 Then said the king [And the king said] to Amasa, Assemble me the men of Ju-
5 dah within three days,[6] and be thou here present. So [And] Amasa went to as-
semble *the men of* [*om.* the men of] Judah; but he tarried longer than the set time
6 which he[7] had appointed him. And David said to Abishai, Now shall [will] Sheba
the son of Bichri do us more harm than *did* Absalom; take thou[8] thy lord's ser-
7 vants, and pursue after him, lest he get him fenced cities, and escape us. And
there went out after him Joab's men, and the Cherethites and the Pelethites and
all the mighty men; and they went out of Jerusalem, to pursue after Sheba the
8 son of Bichri. When they were at the great stone which is in Gibeon, Amasa went
before them [came towards them]. And Joab's garment that he had put on was
girded unto him [And[9] Joab was girded with his military dress as his garment],
and upon it a girdle *with* [of] a sword fastened upon his loins in the sheath thereof
9 [its sheath], and as he[10] went forth, it fell out. And Joab said to Amasa, Art thou
in health, my brother? And Joab took Amasa by the beard with the right hand
10 to kiss him. But [And] Amasa took no heed to the sword that was in Joab's hand;
so [and] he smote him therewith in the fifth *rib* [into the belly], and shed out his
bowels to the ground, and struck him not again; and he died. So [And] Joab and
11 Abishai his brother pursued after Sheba the son of Bichri. And one of Joab's
men [young men] stood by him, and said, He that favoureth Joab, and he that is
for David, *let him go* after Joab. And Amasa wallowed in blood in the midst of
12 the highway. And when [*om.* when] the man saw that all the people stood still,
[*ins.* and] he removed Amasa out of the highway into the field, and cast a cloth
upon him, when he saw that every one that came by him stood still [*or*, because
13 every one that came on him saw and stood still]. When he was removed out of
the highway, all the people [every man] went on after Joab to pursue after Sheba
14 the son of Bichri. And he went through all the tribes of Israel unto Abel and
to Beth-maachah and all the Berites;[11] and they were gathered together, and went
also after him.
15 And they came and besieged him in Abel of Beth-maachah [Abel-beth-maa-
chah], and they cast up a bank against the city, and it stood in the trench [at the
outer wall]; and all the people that were with Joab battered[12] the wall to throw it

[6] [Ver. 4. Before "three days" Wellh. thinks ו ("and") necessary, since the עֲמֹד is defined by this term of days. But as Amasa is ordered to present himself immediately after assembling the troops, the time assigned to this assembling will of course apply also to his coming, so that the insertion of "and" is unnecessary.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 5. As subject of the verb Sept. supplies "David," Vulg. "the king," and Syr. "king David," which seem to be explanatory insertions, and do not call for correction of the simpler Heb. text (against Böttcher).—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 6. Instead of אתה some MSS. and printed editions have עַתָּה "now" (Vulg. *igitur*), and the ancient versions (except Chald.) add the *Dat. commodi* לִי "me."—Instead of the Sing. עֵינֵנוּ some MSS. and EDD. have the Plural "eyes." Eng. A. V. follows the Vulg. in rendering: "escape us." This phrase and the reading "Joab" instead of "Abishai" are discussed in the Exposition.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 8. This is the only possible translation of the Heb. text; but the whole sentence is difficult. The word לְבוּשׁ "garment," occurs only in poetical passages (so 2 Kings x. 22 perhaps) and in late prose (Esth.), and the מַד — "garment" (especially, military dress) is construed with the verb לבשׁ, not with חגר, see 1 Sam. xvii. 38, 39; Lev. vi. 3. It would be simpler to read: וְיוֹאָב לָבוּשׁ (מַדָּיו or, מִדּוֹ) "and Joab was dressed in his military dress," the rest of the verse following as in the Heb., except that instead of the substantive חֲגוֹר "girdle" we should read the adjective חגור (or the fem.) "girded:" "and on it was girded a sword, *etc.*" The first חגור may have been repeated from the second. Wellhausen quotes the Itala: "*et Joab indutus est mandyam indutoriam suam super se et gladium rudentem in vagina sua cinctus erat ad lumbos suos*" and gets a Heb. text that reads: "and Joab was clothed in his military dress on him, and with a sword fastened in his sheath he was girded upon his loins," where the reference of the עָלָיו to לְבוּשׁ is not good, and the change of order in the latter part of the verse is unnecessary.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 8. Erdmann: "and it ((*i. e.*, the sheath) came out, and it (the sword) fell." But this change of subject is harsh, and it is better to read הִיא יָצְאָה: "it (the sword) came out (of the sheath) and fell." The Eng. A. V., referring the coming out to Joab, makes no sense. We may see also how appropriately the word בְּתַעְרָהּ "in its sheath" stands at the end of the sentence, just before the statement that the sword fell out of the sheath.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 14. Or, "all Berim" (Philippson), as the name of a region. Sept. ἐν χαῤῥί, Syr. קֻרְין "cities" (misreading), Chald. Berim (a region) Vulg. *electi*, from בָּרָה "to choose" (Philippson), or — בחורים (Böttcher, Thenius, Wellh., Erdmann). *Bib.-Com.* suggests that בֵּרִים means "fortresses" (from בִּירָה), but no such form occurs. It is better to read: "and all the choice young men were gathered together, *etc.*" The rendering "gathered" is of the Qeri, which is supported by the versions, and by many MSS. and EDD. Chandler adopts as Kethib יִקָּלְהוּ "they were ardently excited," pursued ardently after him."—Tr.]

[12] [Ver. 15. Literally: "were rasing (or, casting down) to make the wall fall," a strange expression. Hence

16 down. Then cried a wise woman out of the city, Hear, hear; say, I pray you, unto
17 Joab, Come near hither, that I may speak with thee. And when he was come
[And he came] near unto her, [*ins.* and] the woman said, Art thou Joab? And
he answered [said] I *am he*. Then [And] she said unto him, Hear the words of
18 thine handmaid. And[13] he answered [said], I do hear. Then she spake [And she
said], saying, They were wont to speak in old time, saying, They shall surely [Let
19 them] ask *counsel* at Abel; and so they ended *the matter*. I *am one of* them that
are peaceable *and* faithful in Israel; thou seekest to destroy a city and a mother
20 [a mother-city] in Israel; why wilt thou swallow up the inheritance of the Lord
[Jehovah]? And Joab answered and said, Far be it, far be it, from me, that I
21 should swallow up or destroy. The matter is not so; but a man of Mount Ephraim,
Sheba the son of Bichri by name, hath lifted up his hand against the king,
even [*om.* even] against David; deliver him only, and I will depart from the city.
And the woman said unto Joab, Behold, his head shall be thrown to thee over
22 [through] the wall. Then [And] the woman went unto all the people in her wisdom.
And they cut off the head of Sheba the son of Bichri, and cast it out to Joab.
And he blew a [the] trumpet, and they retired [dispersed] from the city, every man
to his tent [tents]. And Joab returned to Jerusalem unto the king.

VI. *David's chief officers after the restoration of his royal authority.* Vers. 23–26.

23 Now [And] Joab was over all the host of Israel; and Benaiah the son of Jehoi-
24 ada was over the Cherethites and over the Pelethites; And Adoram was over the
25 tribute; and Jehoshaphat the son of Ahilud was recorder; And Sheva was scribe;
26 and Zadok and Abiathar were the [*om.* the] priests; And Ira also the Jairite was
a chief ruler[14] about [to] David.

Ewald, Böttcher, Thenius and Erdmann make the participle a denominative from שַׁחַת "a pit," and render: "were digging ditches to throw down the wall." But the form is elsewhere unknown (and none of the ancient versions suggest it here), and the military practice thus described is doubtful. As the text stands the word hardly yields a fair sense. But Chald. renders מִתְעַשְּׁתִין "were thinking, purposing," which agrees with the Sept. ἐνοοῦσαν, and perhaps represents the Heb. מְחַשְּׁבִים (Wellh.); "the people were devising to throw down the wall."—Tr.]

[13] [Ver. 18. The Sept. is the only ancient version that offers material for alteration of the text of the woman's speech, and this is discussed by Erdmann. Chald. paraphrases: "And she said, saying, Remember now what is written in the book of the law to ask of the peace of a city (Walton's Polygl: to ask of a city) in the beginning, saying, was it in this wise thy duty to ask of Abel, whether they are peaceable? We are peaceable, in fidelity with Israel, *etc.*;" on this interpretation see further in notes to the Exposition. Syr.: "The woman said, They used to say of old time that they asked the prophets, and then they destroyed; am I to make satisfaction for the sins of Israel, that thou desirest to slay the child and his mother in Israel?" where the misreadings (נְבִיאִים for אבל and נַעַר for עִיר) are obvious. These versions (and the Vulg.) confirm the Heb. text, which, with all its difficulties, seems preferable to the Sept. variation adopted by Ewald and Wellhausen.—Tr.]

[14] [Ver. 26. כֹּהֵן the word ordinarily rendered "priest." See on viii. 18.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 41–43. *Strife between Judah and Israel about bringing David back.*

Ver. 41 [40 *b*, Heb. 41 *b*]. The text (ק׳) would be rendered: "and as to the whole people of Judah, they had conducted," *etc.* (Keil). But this would be a strange and heavy construction, and the Qeri or margin is preferable ["and . . . Judah conducted," as in Eng. A. V.]. This last clause is to be connected with the following verse (Thenius): "and when all the people of Judah had conducted the king, and also half the people of Israel, behold, then came all the men of Israel," *etc.* Besides Judah, *half the people of Israel also* acted as David's escort over the Jordan. This part of Israel consisted first of the thousand Benjaminites that had come with Shimei, and then of others living *near by*, especially, it is probable, from the east-jordanic district (S. Schmid). The passage over the Jordan was completed, and David (as appears from the connection) with his escort had reached *Gilgal* (Bunsen), when *there*, not "at the *Jordan*" (Then., Ew.), "all the men of Israel," that is, the body of deputized representatives of the other tribes (Clericus) arrived and made their complaint to David: **Why have our brethren the men of Judah stolen thee away?** escorted thee over so secretly, without informing us of their purpose? By directing this question to *David*, they at the same time reproached him, for "very probably it had been learned that he had a hand in the movement, see vers. 11, 12" (Then.). "*All David's men*" are the faithful followers that had fled with him from Jerusalem (xv. 17 sqq.). In all this we see, on the one hand, the discord between the main divisions of the nation, Judah and Israel, and on the other the eager rivalry in the exhibition of devotion to the king, which, however, contained in itself the seeds of further disorder.

Grotius: "an honorable contest—but, heated by bitter words, it afforded opportunity to those that desired revolution. 'Honorable indeed,' says Tacitus, 'but the source of the worst things' (Annal. I.)."—Ver. 42. Not David, but the representatives of the tribe of Judah answered the reproach. Literally: "the men of Judah answered *against* (Böttcher) the men of Israel," they *met* them with an answer.—There is no need to insert (Thenius, after Sept., Syr., Arab.) "and said" after the word "Israel," as in ver. 43; Böttcher remarks that the "and said" is omitted also in 1 Sam. ix. 17; xx. 28.—**Because the king is nearer to me** (*not:* "the king is near to me"); the "because" is the answer to the "why?" of ver. 41. *Near* = near of kin, comp. v. 1. **Why art thou angry?** there is no ground for it. [The Singular Pronoun here used (Eng. A. V. substitutes the Plural) perhaps refers to the individual speaker, who represented the nation or tribe, or the nation or tribe may be regarded as a unit.—Tr.]—**Have we eaten of the king?** To eat of the king = to be fed by the royal bounty (Clericus). Have we enjoyed advantages from him? Have you reason to be envious of us because we have enjoyed advantages that you were deprived of? Whether this is also a side-hit at the *Benjaminites* (Mich., Then., Buns., Keil), who enjoyed many favors from *Saul* (comp. 1 Sam. xxii. 7), must be left undecided; nothing of this sort is indicated in the words or the connection. "Or, has anything been taken by us?" *not:* "has he given us any gift?"* [so Eng. A. V., whose rendering is defended in "Text. and Gram."—Tr.].—Ver. 43. The men of Israel's answer to this hot discourse of the Judahites is still hotter. Over against the latter's *qualitative* relation to David ("he is nearer to us") they set the *numerical quantitative:* **Ten parts have I in the king, and also in David more than thou.**—The "ten parts" are the ten tribes as against the two, "Judah and *Benjamin*" (Theodoret); "the tribe of Benjamin might already after the removal of the royal residence to Jerusalem have attached itself more to *Judah*, as indeed it now came a thousand strong with Judah, and afterwards with this tribe formed the Judah-kingdom, 1 Kings xii. 21" (Thenius). Add to this that Jerusalem was within the tribe of Benjamin just on the border of Judah. The *king* belonged to the *whole* nation, and therefore Israel, with its ten tribes, had a ten-fold part in and claim on the king.—**And also in David more than thou.**—The above general statement is here specialized and individualized in respect to the *person* of David. The men of Israel had indeed "deserved very ill of him." But this cannot be urged against the genuineness of the reading: "in David" (Then.), for the men of Judah had behaved still worse, since the insurrection originated among them. But Israel's claim to superiority to Judah in having ten parts "*also in David*" "does not refer to the fact that the insurrection began in Judah" (O. v. Gerlach), for they (Israel) had straightway joined the rebellion. The words are to be taken simply in closest connection with the previous numerical statement in reference to the king. The sense is: in the kingdom of Israel you have no claim to a nearer relation to the king, who is put there for *all* the tribes, and to whom as king all the tribes stand equally near, so that we, with our ten, have a ten-fold claim on him. As this is true of every king, *so also of David.* Seb. Schmid: "David is here considered not as of the tribe of Judah, but as king. *But now* we have ten parts in the king, *therefore* also in David as king, and so your argument from consanguinity is worthless." This hair-splitting calculation and passionate assertion of the mere numerical relation to David is psychologically quite characteristic of the ill feeling towards Judah that prevailed in Israel. Instead of "and also *in David* more than thou," Böttcher and Thenius adopt the reading of the Sept.: "and I am *first-born** (more) than thou." But this reading is suspicious at the outset, because the Sept. has also the reading of the Heb. text. Then Thenius' explanation of the term "first-born" from the tribes of Reuben and Simeon, whose ancestors were born *before* Judah, does not apply to the other tribes, whose stem-fathers were born *after* Judah; and to understand the term as meaning *at the same time* (Thenius) that "*Israel* after *Saul's death* had held to his dynasty and continued the national name," seems very far-fetched.—**Why hast thou despised me?**—The men of Israel felt that they had been made little of in that they had not been informed of the restoration and permitted to take part in it. In contrast with the solidarity of the revolutionary movement, which had united both sections, they here emphasize the jointness of the desire for and return to the old fealty.—**And was not my word the first to bring back my king?** Literally: "and was not my word first to me to bring back my king?" On Israel's "word," comp. xix. 10, 11. The "to me" is not to be attached (Keil) against the accents (and against the order of the words) to "bring back" [= "bring back to me"], but is apposition to "my word," to emphasize the possessive pronoun "my" (Ges., § 121, 3), and to bring out strongly the thought that Israel had first spoken of and counselled the king's restoration.—*Judah's reply* to Israel's words was still *harder*, more violent, than they. A violent war of words flamed up, wherein Israel, as feeling itself the aggrieved party, was led to a new, evil purpose, which shaped itself into a repetition of the rebellion just crushed. Comp. a Lapide: "This scene paved the way to Sheba's war. Learn from this proud quarrel of Judah and Israel how true is the proverb in Prov. xv. 1."

Ch. xx. 1–22. *Sheba's insurrection, Israel's defection, both quelled by Joab.*—Ver. 1. **There was† there,** namely, in Gilgal at the assembly

* נִשָּׂא is not Piel, and נִשֵּׂאת Pi. Particip. ("hath he given us a gift?"), for the Pi. is elsewhere נִשֵּׂא, and this construction would require הוּא. And though נִשֵּׂא פ' בְּ — "to help one with gifts" (1 Kings ix. 11), our phrase does not therefore mean "to give to one" (Böttcher). Rather we have here the Perf. Niph. with Absol. Infin. (fem., as verbs ה ל', Ewald § 240 *d*), corresponding to אָכֹל, literally: "has anything been as to taking taken by us?"—has any thing at all been taken by us?

* בְּכוֹר instead of בְּדָוִד.

† נִקְרָא "there happened," Niph. of קרא—קרה "to

of the tribes; the word "there" indicates directly the *place*, indirectly the *time* of the following history, so that the *causal connection* between it and the preceding scene is obvious. On the person of Sheba, Luther remarks (probably correctly) in his marginal notes: "he was one of the great rogues of the high nobility, who had a large retinue among the people, and consideration or name, as Catiline at Rome."* He was a "wicked" man (Luther: *heilloser* [Eng. A. V. wrongly: "son of Belial]), comp. 1 Sam. xxv. 17, 25. **A Benjaminite**, probably (to judge from his conduct) one of the rabid Sauline party, if he were not (as is possible) of Saul's own family—**We have no part in David**.—This is said in contrast with xix. 42, 43, and with a sharp emphasis on the "no" ["*there is not* to us part in David"]. David is called **the son of Jesse** contemptuously in contrast with *Saul*. "We have nothing in common with him, nothing to do with him," comp. Deut. x. 9. From his *blowing the trumpet* it may be surmised that he was a military commander, having control of a somewhat large body of men.—**Every man to his tents**, that is, home, as in xviii. 17; xix. 9. The expression is an echo from the tent-life of the people in the wilderness.—Ver. 2. All Israel "went up" from David, namely, from the plain of Gilgal to the hill-country of Ephraim. The whole representation of Israel listens to Sheba's rebellious signal, and follows him, which is to be explained only by the anger against Judah, freshly excited by the quarrel over bringing the king back. The men of Judah "clave to their king," crowded close around him [rather, faithfully adhered to him—Tr.] and escorted him "from the Jordan to Jerusalem." The expression: "from the *Jordan*" does not contradict the fact that the assembly took place in *Gilgal* (as Thenius holds from this, that it took place on the Jordan); it is not to be explained (with Keil against Thenius) by the remark that the "Judahites" had already escorted the king *over the Jordan*, but (Gilgal being near the Jordan) is to be taken as a general designation, such as we often use in respect to rivers.

Ver. 3. *David's return to his house at Jerusalem.* **The ten concubines** (xv. 16; xvi. 20 sqq.) **that he had left behind—he put in a house of ward**, and maintained them, but remained apart from them.† Grotius: "He pardoned their fear indeed [*i. e.*, their fault committed through fear], but would not approach them, since they were impure for him (having been approached by his son), nor let others approach them, as they were royal concubines." They lived in "widowhood of life,"‡ that is, "whereas death had entered the house, widowhood *during the lifetime of the husband*." (Böttch.), comp. Deut. xxiv. 1 sqq.; Isa. i. 1. [So Targum, Gill, Philippson. It may also be rendered: "in a lifelong widowhood," *i. e.*, as long as they lived; but the objection to this is, that it repeats the statement of the preceding clause.—Tr.]—Ver. 4. **And the king said to Amasa, Call me,** *etc.*, namely, to follow and attack the insurgent Sheba. In giving Amasa this commission, David's purpose is to fulfil to him his promise, xix. 14. **And do thou present thyself here**, after three days, when the men of Judah shall have assembled, that thou mayest lead them out to battle. Then David intended formally to appoint him commander-in-chief, and assign him the more important duties. In various respects David here acted unwisely: 1) in bestowing on the late insurgent leader, Amasa an unbounded confidence, that was soon proved to be misplaced, vers. 5, 6; 2) in respect to Joab who, with all his rudeness and cruelty, had remained faithful to David, and by his splendid victory over Amasa, had saved the kingdom; 3) in respect to his faithful tribe of Judah, who must have been offended by this preference shown for the leader of the revolution. [On the other hand, the insurgent Judahites might be pleased by this honor done their general (comp. xix. 14), and the men of Israel affected by seeing their former general in David's service (Patrick); Amasa had probably shown himself an efficient commander, and Joab was not undeserving of punishment.—Tr.). —Ver. 5. **He tarried* over the set time,** (three days), either because he met with distrust and opposition among the people, and could not so soon execute his commission, or because he *did not wish* to make haste, and nourished in his breast traitorous designs, [or, possibly, because of natural lack of vigor.—Tr.].—Ver. 6. **And David said to Abishai.** Instead of "Abishai," Thenius (after Syr. and Josephus) would read "*Joab*," since from the present text we cannot account for the appearance of Joab in ver. 8, (he is previously not mentioned—only his people mentioned in ver. 7); the "men of Joab" would certainly not have marched out, unless Joab had had the supreme command. He takes the original reading (after the Sept.) in ver. 7 to be: "and there marched out after him *Abishai and* the men of Joab," and thinks that from this, "*Abishai*" got into ver. 6 instead of "Joab," while in ver. 7 the word "Abishai" fell out from its likeness to the following word (אנשׁי). Against which Böttcher rightly says that the Syriac and Josephus here made an arbitrary change in the Hebrew, and put "Joab" instead of Abishai, because they thought (from what follows) that the former ought to be named here. "How," asks Böttcher, "if *Joab* had originally stood in the text, could *Abishai* have been *accidentally* or *purposely* written for it, since the two names are very different, and Abishai is not mentioned till ver. 10?" Rather in the Sept. (Cod. Vat.) the *Abishai* might have gotten from ver. 6 (beginning) into ver. 7 (beginning); indeed its insertion is evi-

---

meet," not from קרא "to call, name"—"a noted, famous man" (Luther).

* [So Patrick, after Victorinus Strigelius; but we know nothing definitely about it.—As Aphiah (1 Sam. ix. 1) is the same as Abiah (1 Chr. vii. 8), Sheba was so far of the same family as Saul.—Tr.]

† אֲלֵיהֶם, masc. suffix for fem., the general, less determined instead of the more determined, Gen. xxxi. 9; Am. iii. 2; 2 Kings xiv. 18, Ew., § 184 *c*. [Some MSS. and EDD. of De Rossi have the Fem.—Tr.]

‡ אַלְמְנוּת, adverbial Acc. defined by חַיּוּת; one cod. of Kennicott had בְּאַלְ (Böttcher). [This reading is given by De Rossi.—Tr.]

* Kethib וַיִּיחֶר is Impf. Pi. of יחר—אחר. Qeri וַיּוֹחֶר is Impf. Hiph. or Qal of the same verb; the latter is unnecessary.

dently due to the exception that was taken to the omission of his name in ver. 7 while in ver. 6 he is entrusted with the command. To get rid of the difficulties, Böttcher proposes to read in ver. 6: "And David said to *Joab:* behold, the three days are past, shall we wait for *Amasa?* now will Sheba, *etc.*," (Sept. Vat. reading: "and David said to Amasa"). But this adoption of a variation of the Sept. (which clearly came from a misunderstanding), and the supposed omission of a whole line by the error of a transcriber is artificial and untrustworthy. There remains nothing but to retain the masoretic text (which is confirmed by all the Versions except the Syriac): "and David *said to Abishai.*" Joab was still David's official commander-in-chief, though the latter had unwisely promised the command to Amasa; the sending of Amasa to collect the troops was indeed occasioned by that promise; but Joab was not yet deprived of the command. But David speaks to *Abishai* about Amasa's delay and *not to Joab*, because he wished to have nothing to do with the latter on account of his crabbedness, and further knew that he would take Amasa's appointment ill. David expresses the apprehension: **Now will Sheba . . . become more hurtful** (dangerous) **than Absalom,** the revolution will become more widespread and powerful than before, unless we march immediately against Sheba. **Take thou thy Lord's servants,** the troops with the king in Jerusalem, the *standing army* (the particular parts of which are mentioned in ver. 7), in distinction from the *levy of the people*, for which Amasa was sent. **And pursue after him,** for, as Sheba had gotten a good start in these three days, everything depended on quickly overtaking him. **Lest he get him fenced cities,**—this he fears has already happened (as the form of the Hebrew verb* shows). **And turn away our eye**; the verb (הִצִּיל) means "to take away" (Gen. xxxi. 9, 16; Ps. cxix. 43; 1 Sam. xxx. 22; Hos. ii. 11), "lest he take away our view," deceive us (Maurer); Vulg.; "and escape us" [so Eng. A. V.]; Gesen. and De Wette: "that he may not escape our eye by throwing himself with his followers into fortified cities" (as actually happened, ver. 15). Maurer well compares the similar expression: "to steal one's heart (mind)," *i. e.*, to deceive him, Gen. xxxi. 20; 2 Sam. xv. 6. Ewald translates: "lest he *trouble* our eye," deriving the verb from a stem † = "to be shaded" (Neh. xiii. 19, comp. Ezek. xxxi. 3), that is, lest he cause us care and vexation; so also Bunsen, and so already the Sept.; "Lest he darken (shade) our eyes." Certainly this translation gives too weak a sense (Then.). But, with this derivation of the verb, the meaning might still be: "that he darken not our sight," hiding himself from us in fortified cities, so that our sight of his hostile preparations is obscured, and we cannot clearly follow and overcome him.—Böttcher, Thenius and Keil, referring to Deut. xxxii. 10; Zech. ii. 10, where the "apple of the eye" is the figure of valuable possession, render: "and *pluck out* our eye," *i. e.*, severely injure us; but it is the *eye*, not the *apple of the eye*, that is here spoken of, nor is there anything here that is compared to the apple of the eye, since the "fortified cities" could not be so meant.—Ver. 7. "After him," that is, after *Abishai.* **The men of Joab**=his immediate military followers, under his special control. Yet they were not the less "David's servants." This view is favored by the expression: "Joab's people." If the phrase were intended to indicate a body of men "that Joab in this emergency had collected at his own costs, and with whom as volunteers he himself as volunteer intended to go into this war" (Ewald), this fact would necessarily have been mentioned in the narrative. **The Cherethites and Pelethites**, the royal body-guard (see on viii. 18), whom "the necessity of the case now brought out" (Ewald). *The Gibborim* [mighty men] are the six hundred heroes, (xv. 8) who with the body-guard accompanied David when he fled from Absalom. These two bodies together with the "men of Joab" formed the only troops now at the king's disposal, whom he calls "the servants of thy lord" (ver. 6). As the case required the greatest haste (ver. 6), he ordered Abishai to follow Sheba for the present with those troops (Ew.). The words "*out of Jerusalem*" are added because of the local statement that follows.—Ver. 8. When they came to **the great stone of Gibeon**—which was doubtless an isolated rock of considerable size. Gibeon lay northwest of Jerusalem in the mountains of Ephraim, whither Sheba (ver. 2) had gone. **Amasa came towards them**, literally "before their face" (De Wette). He was (ver. 4) to have proclaimed the arriere-ban [summoned the people to war] in Judah. Here he is found in the tribe of Benjamin. As he meets the troops advancing to the northwest, he must be coming from the opposite direction, as we should expect from David's order. The cause of his delay thus was that he had gone northward from Judah into Benjamin. Coming thence on his way to Jerusalem (ver. 4) with the troops he had raised, he meets these others at "the great stone in Gibeon." Here Joab, before mentioned, suddenly comes on the scene. As David had not deprived him of the command, we must suppose that he was advancing with the permanent force under Abishai to the field, where Amasa's retarded levies were to join him. Joab regarded himself as still commander-in-chief, and, that Amasa might not attain this honor, he put him out of the way (ver. 10) by murder. It is not to be assumed that David (ver. 6) had ordered Abishai to march out with *Joab*, and that this is not mentioned for brevity's sake (Keil), nor that David had given Joab the command (omitted in this compendious account) to go along to the field.—The minute description of Joab's military dress and arms is intended to make it clear how the latter could suddenly kill Amasa without any one's noticing his purpose. "And Joab was girded with his military coat as his clothing,*

---

* פֶּן with the Perf., in expressions "of *fear* of a thing that, as is *almost certainly* conjectured, has already happened — μή, 2 Kings ii. 16; x. 23" (Ew. § 337 *b*).

† הִצִּיל as Hiph. of צלל.

* לְבֻשׁוֹ "his clothing" is descriptive addition to מִדּוֹ "his military garment," over which he had put the sword-girdle. It is unnecessary (with Then., after Sept. and Vulg.) to point חָגוּר "girded" instead of חֲגוֹר "girdle."

and on it the girdle of the sword, which was fastened on his loins in its sheath; and this [the sheath] came out, and it [the sword] fell down." The girdle is expressly mentioned in order to show how the sword did not depend from it as usual, but, with its sheath, was thrust in and held by it (Thenius). "And it (referring to the preceding "sheath") came out" of the girdle, as if accidentally in consequence of a movement, "and it (the sword) fell to the ground"; so Maurer, Böttcher. Mich., Dathe, Schulz render: "he brought (Hiphil) it (the sword) out, so that it fell"; but this, inasmuch as it is supported by no ancient version, is arbitrary. To render "and he (Joab) went forth" (De Wette, Keil [Eng. A. V., Philippson, *Bib.-Com.*]) is against the connection, since it does not appear whence Joab went forth. [A slight change in the Hebrew, making pronoun and verb feminine (after Sept., and substantially Vulg.) will give: "and it (the sword) came out and fell down," which is much simpler and more natural.—Tr.]—Ver. 9. Joab performed this manipulation with the sword just before he met Amasa, making such a movement that the sword should fall, as it were accidentally, to the ground, and he could take it up in his *left* hand, so as with the *right* hand to lay hold of Amasa's beard in friendly greeting. No surprise would be felt, therefore, at his holding the sword in his left hand, with which he had taken it up from the ground. From the friendly address: **Art thou in health, my brother?** Amasa would all the less suspect anything evil, since he was Joab's rival. The *grasping the beard* with the right hand is not for the purpose of kissing the *beard** (Winer, Art. *Bart.*), but is a caressing gesture, like an embrace, intended to draw down the face to kiss it [so Eng. A. V., to kiss him]. So Amasa could suspect no evil. ["My *brother*"—he was his first cousin, 1 Chr. iii. 16, 17 (*Bib.-Com.*).—Tr.]—Ver. 10. **And Amasa took no heed to the sword that was in Joab's** (left) **hand.** The murder of Amasa by Joab was, therefore, a cleverly contrived and malicious act, the product of jealousy and desire of revenge. "Thus this rude soldier's friendship and repose was merely a pretence, that he might take his revenge at the first opportunity" (Ewald). "He did it not the second time," did not repeat the blow; his stroke was mortal! [He stabbed him in the belly (not "in the fifth rib," as in Eng. A. V.), so that his bowels came out.—Tr.]. With the same violence that he had shown in the murder, Joab, with his brother Abishai, now rushes after Sheba, without bestowing a moment's notice on Amasa struggling in the agonies of death. The words: **Joab and Abishai his brother,** from the connection favor the view that Joab had gone out at the head (together with Abishai) of the body of troops under Abishai.—Ver. 11. One of Joab's henchmen remained by (עָל) Amasa; no doubt at Joab's command, in order to send Amasa's levies on to Joab and Abishai with the cry: "He that hath pleasure in Joab, etc."; *pleasure:* Joab, used to victory, doubtless inspired more confidence. "And he that is *for David*"—this refers to the defection from David into which Amasa had led the people, [and is intended to identify Joab's cause with David's.—Tr.].—Ver. 12 sqq. How vivid and touching the picture here of Amasa wallowing in his blood on the road, the advancing crowd of people stopping by him, his consequent hasty removal from the road, and the throwing a cloth over him to hide him from the sight of the passers-by, and so to prevent their stopping, and avoid the possible unfavorable impression for Joab and his cause that the sight of the body would make on the people! [Nobody knew the cause of his death, in the hurry there was no time to inquire, the danger from Sheba was imminent, and so the crowd passed on without investigating the matter. —Tr.]—Ver. 13. Only now, it is expressly stated, do the people follow on after Joab without delay. "Every man (or, all the men) went on." As it is clear from the context that these are Amasa's levies out of Israel, it is not necessary (with Then., after Sept.) to insert "of Israel" after "all the men."—Ver. 14. "And he went through." This refers to *Joab*, who now, as general-in-chief of the army, rushed through *all the tribes of Israel* northward from Ephraim (Manasseh, Issachar, Zebulon, Naphtali), Sheba flying before him and first reaching a strong position in the extreme north. [Others (Patrick, Wellhausen) think that *Sheba* is here the subject, and this is favored by the fact that the "*him*" in ver. 15 (and so in ver. 14, end) which refers to Sheba, seems to represent the same person as the subject of the verb "went through;" moreover this verb would naturally refer to the person last mentioned in ver. 13.—Tr.] **To Abel and Beth-Maachah.**—*Abel*, in the north of Naphtali, very near Beth-Maachah, the two being near and west of *Ijon* [Iyyon] and *Dan* (1 Kings xv. 20; 2 Kings xv. 29); in 2 Chron. xvi. 4 it is called Abel-*mayim*, from the neighboring lake Merom on the south, or, more probably, from the well-watered Merj Ayun, the present village *Abil el Kamh*, *i. e.*, *Wheat-meadow*. On account of its proximity to Beth-Maachah, it is often combined with this = Abel-Beth-Maacah, ver. 15; 1 Kings xv. 20; 2 Kings xv. 29; but the "and" here connecting the two names is not for that reason to be stricken out (Ewald, Thenius). By the addition "Beth-Maachah" and Mayim (2 Chron. xvi. 4) it is distinguished from several other places of this name [Abel], which signifies "meadow." If the word *Berim* (בֵּרִים) indicates a region of country [Eng. A. V.: *Berites*] it must be connected with the preceding verb: **and he went through all Berim,** though then the absence of the preposition [in the Heb., as in Eng. A. V.], and still more, this appended statement of place after it has been mentioned to what point Joab went, would be surprising. But no such region is known in northern Palestine, nor any similar name of a place. We are therefore justified in supposing a corruption of the text. A suggestion for an emendation of the text is given by the Sept.: "to Beth-Maachah, and all *in Charri* [this suggests the Heb. *bachurim*, "choice, chosen young men"], and they were gathered together," *etc.*; and by the Vulg.: "and all the *chosen men* were assembled to him." Clericus remarks that this

* [However it is a custom in the East to kiss the beard (d'Arvieux in Philippson).—Tr.]

looks as if they read "chosen" (הבחורים), but declines to express a judgment in the matter. We must probably read:* "and all kinds of arms-bearing men" (Then., Winer, *s. v.*, *Habarim*), or: "and all the (there residing) young men" (Ew., Böttch.). Böttcher thinks it probable (but without sufficient ground) that we should add: "who were in the *cities*." We may render then (changing to Perfect the following verb): "and all the young men were gathered together,"† *etc.*, or (keeping the form in the text): "and all the young men, and (as an additional fact) they were gathered together and went also after him," *i. e.*, in his march through all the tribes to Abel and Beth-Maachah. That is, the young men as far as the extreme north gathered about him; the "also" refers to the statement in ver. 13 that "every man went on after Joab," that is, all that had assembled in Ephraim at Gibeon [ver. 8]; to these were added all the young men in the other tribes. Thereby the victory was already decided for Joab.

Ver. 15 sqq. *Sheba besieged.*—Sheba had found refuge in *Abel*‡-*Beth-Maachah*—a strongly fortified place, which, as fortress, served by the quantity of water about it, also as a protection towards the north and east. In this city **they besieged him.**—He had therefore thrown himself into it. It cannot be gathered from the connection that the inhabitants (who could have done nothing against his sudden seizure of the city) took part with Sheba against David; we may rather infer from the procedure of the "wise woman" that they were opposed to the insurgent. **They threw up an embankment against the city; and it** (the embankment) **stood**—that is, rose at [= joined on to] the wall of the outer works of the fortress, the outer wall (Sept. προτειχίσματι [the *pomerium*, or open space without the wall, in which the embankment was placed in order the more easily to batter the city-walls.—Tr.]). The rest of ver. 15 is to be taken as protasis, the apodosis beginning with ver. 16: "And as all the people, *etc.*, then cried a wise woman." The usual rendering: "as they destroyed, in order to throw down the wall" [so Eng. A. V.] involves a contradiction; for if they destroyed, what was left to be thrown down? and this verb (שָׁחַת) is used (Ezek. xxvi. 4) of the *complete tearing down* of walls (Then.). Also in ver. 20 Joab says: "Far be it from me to destroy." It is better with Ewald and Böttcher§ to take the Participle as a denominative (from שַׁחַת, "a pit, ditch"), and render: "they dug ditches to throw down the wall," by undermining. Josephus: "he ordered them to undermine the walls." **Then cried a wise woman** (comp. xiv. 2 sq.; 1 Sam. xxv. 3 sq.) **from the city.**—This expression gives a sufficiently vivid picture of the situation, and there is no need (with Thenius) to change the text after Syr. and Arab.: "down from the wall of the city," and Sept.: "from the wall," where the differences of wording show these renderings to be explanatory local descriptions.—Ver. 18 sqq. The woman's words to Joab are variously explained. Maurer (after Dathe: "inquiry ought first, said she, to have been made of Abel, and then it ought to have been decided what is to be done") renders: "and she said: it should first have been said: 'let the city be consulted;' so they would have finished the matter." So also De Wette: "one should first have said: one must inquire in Abel, and so the end would have been reached." But this is too artificial an expression for the situation. The same remark is to be made of Böttcher's translation: "And she said, as if she would say: One should first, however, speak, speak, as if she would say: 'One should ask, ask in Abel; and so the matter would be finished;'" that is, the woman protested against Joab's violent procedure without previous negotiation. Certainly such a protest is to be supposed in the woman's words. But these are to be translated (with Thenius) simply after the text as follows: "They used to say in old time: let Abel be inquired of; and so they ended (the matter)." Vulg.*: "It was said in the old proverb: those that ask, ask in Abel; and so they finished." Sept.: "It was formerly said, They shall ask in Abel, and so they left off." The sense is: It was formerly a proverbial saying: "inquire at Abel," and if the decision there made was acted on, the affair was satisfactorily concluded; so now, the inhabitants of Abel ought first to have been communicated with, instead of straightway investing and besieging the city; then your design respecting Sheba would have been accomplished. It is assumed and affirmed that Abel was proverbial for the discretion and wisdom of its inhabitants. This wisdom the "wise woman" illustrates factually by her discourse. It is to be noted also that the negotiation before laying siege to a city (and a foreign city, indeed) such as the woman here refers to, is prescribed in the law, Deut. xx. 10 sqq., comp. Num. xxi. 21.—Some codices of the Sept. read: "It was formerly said, It was asked in Abel *and in Dan* if they left off *what the faithful of Israel established*," after which Ewald† adopts as original text: "Let it be asked in Abel and in Dan, whether what the devout men of

---

* כָּל־בַּחֻרִים (Then.) or כָּל־הַבַּחֻרִים (Ew.). Sept.: πάντες ἐν χαῤῥί, as if כָּל־בַּחֻרִי. [On this reading see further in "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

† Instead of the Kethib ויקלהו we are to read the Qeri ויקהלו (Sept., Vulg., Chald.). If, instead of changing this to Perfect נִקְהֲלוּ, we keep the Impf. וַיִּקָּהֲלוּ, the ו must be regarded as adding a new statement, as in Gen. xxii. 24; 1 Sam. xxv. 27 (Böttcher).

‡ On the ָה in בְּאָבֵלָה Böttcher remarks: "where the relation remains purely local (which is not the case in ver. 18), the adverbial ָה in innumerable cases remains *with* the Preposition in names of cities."

§ Böttcher: שָׁחַת may easily, along with its proper Hiph., have had a denominative Hiph. from שַׁחַת,—"to make ditches;" comp. הִפְרִים, proper Hiphil of פָּרַם, and also denominative from פַּרְסָה—"to cleave the hoof," and הִשְׁבִּיר, Hiph. of שָׁבַר and denom. from שֶׁבֶר,—"to sell grain." [On this and the proposed rendering: "they thought (= were trying) to throw down the wall," see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

* Vulg.: *Sermo, inquit, dicebatur in veteri proverbio: qui interrogant, interrogant in Abela, et sic perficiebant.* Sept.: καὶ εἶπε λόγος ἐλαλήθη ἐν πρώτοις, λεγόντων· Ἐρωτῶντες ἐπερωτήσουσιν ἐν Ἀβέλ, καὶ οὕτως ἐξέλιπον.

† Sept. εἰ ἐξέλιπον ἃ ἔθεντο οἱ πιστοὶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Ew.: בְּאָבֵל וּבְדָן הֲתַמּוּ אֲשֶׁר שָׂמוּ אֱמוּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

Israel formerly ordained has there gone out of use" [that is, if, when a new custom comes up, one wishes to find out whether old Israelitish usage exists anywhere, he must go to Abel and Dan; the implication being that Joab is violating old custom.—Tr.] But Keil rightly remarks that this addition of the Sept. ("what the devout men," *etc.*), which is critically of so little value that Tisch. in his edition of the Sept. does not think it worthy of mention, is evidently a gloss or paraphrase of the last words of the verse: "and so they finished" [in connection with the "faithful in Israel" of the next verse.—Tr.] [Tisch. in his Sept. (4th ed.) does give these words as a part of the text of the Vatican manuscript; but they seem to be clearly a duplet or double rendering.—Tr.]—Ver. 19. **I am of the peaceable, faithful ones of Israel.** The woman says "I" in the name of the city; the plural predicates ["peaceable, faithful"] refer to the inhabitants of the city. Clericus: "I am of the number of the peaceable and faithful in Israel, says our city." The meaning is: We are peaceable and faithful people, averse to insurrection; you ought first to have communicated with us, and then the thing would have been understood. It is herein indirectly stated that the city had no thought of taking part with Sheba, who had thrown himself into it. Whether this was the feeling in the city from the beginning, or was reached only when it was threatened with destruction by the siege, cannot be determined. Anyhow the woman was able cleverly to avert the threatened evil.—Böttcher changes the text, so as to read: "people* (that are) the peaceablest, truest in Israel thou seekest to kill," and Ewald: "we are (or better, we are still) peaceable, *etc.*, and thou seekest," *etc.*; but there is no necessity for any change.—**Thou seekest to kill a city and mother in Israel,** that is, one of the chief cities of Israel, comp. viii. 1. **Why wilt thou destroy the inheritance of the Lord?** The city pertained to the people that the Lord had chosen for His possession. Comp. the discourse of the wise woman of Tekoah, xiv. 16. [Though the Heb. text of the woman's discourse here is harsh and obscure, no proposed changes better it. As it stands, she seems to say: "Abel is proverbial for its wisdom. You should have entered into negotiations with us instead of attempting to destroy an important city in Israel." The margin of Eng. A. V. reads: "they plainly spake in the beginning, saying, Surely they will ask of Abel, and so make an end," that is, in the beginning of the siege the inhabitants expressed the expectation that Joab would communicate with them, and this rendering is approved by Patrick as more literal than the text of Eng. A. V.; but it does not give the proverb-like coloring of the original. Philippson mentions among other Jewish renderings that of the Midrash which haggadistically identifies the wise woman with Serah, the daughter of Asher (Gen. xlvi. 17), who is made to refer in her sharp discourse with Joab to Deut. xx. 10, the law of sieges. Erdmann also holds that this law is here alluded to; but there is no intimation of this; the woman intimates only generally that it would have been conducive to a proper understanding if Joab had communicated with the besieged.—Tr.]—Ver. 20 sqq. Joab, impressed by the woman's words, declares that it is not his purpose to destroy the city, but only to get possession of the insurgent Sheba, who [ver. 21] **has lifted up his hand against the king.** Perhaps the woman first learned from these words the real state of the case and the guilt of Sheba. She said immediately that his head should be thrown *through the wall*, through one of the *openings* in the wall, where the besieged might watch and shoot at the enemy, and through which perhaps she spoke with Joab. [Eng. A. V., wrongly: "*over* the wall."—Tr.]—Ver. 22. **She went to all the people,** to report concerning her interview with Joab—a self-evident fact that it was unnecessary to mention in the text. After "people" Sept. adds: "and spoke to the whole city," a correct explanatory remark, but not to be inserted in the text (as Ew. and Then. think). Equally unnecessary is Böttcher's alteration: "and the woman went *into the city, and spoke* to all the people." The words of the text: **She came . . . in her wisdom** (*i. e.*, with her proposition to Joab, which she persuaded the people to accept) are indeed of laconic curtness; but this quite suits this rapid narration. By the delivery of the traitor's head Joab's end was gained. **He ordered the trumpet to be sounded,** as sign that the army should retire from the siege, and set out on the return-march. **And they dispersed from the city,** namely, the warriors that had joined him (ver. 13). **And Joab returned,** with the warriors with whom he had left Jerusalem (ver. 7), **to the king,** to announce to him the end of the insurrection. "The issue of this occurrence, how David received the victorious Joab, is omitted in our present narrative; he was doubtless now also forbearing to a man who as a soldier was indispensable to him, and who, with all his punishment-deserving savagery, always meant well for his government" (Ewald).

Vers. 23–26. *List of David's highest officers* after the restoration of his authority. See the Introduction, p. 18 sq., as to the relation between this list and that in viii. 16–18, and their position and significance in respect to the two chief periods of the history of David and his kingdom, of which history they form the conclusion. [The two lists are appropriately placed at the two beginnings of David's kingdom, and the differences between them are explained by the changes brought by time.—Tr.]—Ver. 23. 1) *Joab*, commander of the whole army* of Israel,—as in viii. 16, except that the "Israel" is not inserted there. Joab remained commander-in-chief notwithstanding David's overhasty decision, xix. 3.—2) *Benaiah*, son of Jehoiada, commander of the bodyguard, as in viii. 18. Comp. 1 Kin. ii. 25–46, where he performed the execution ordered by Solomon, and ver. 35, where he is named commander-in-chief in Joab's place, and as such is

* Böttcher: אַנְשֵׁי instead of אָנֹכִי. Ewald: אֲנַחְנוּ or עוֹדֶנּוּ, and ו before אַתָּה.

* הַצָּבָא, Abs. instead of Const., probably "from the error of a transcriber, who wrote this frequently-occurring form before he noticed that the word 'Israel' followed" (Thenius).

mentioned in the list of Solomon's state-officers, iv. 1–6. He was over the Cherethites and Pelethites. *Cherethites* is the marginal reading, for which the text has the equivalent *Cari* * (2 Kin. xi. 1, 19); see on viii. 18.—Ver. 24.—3) *Adoram* (1 Kin. xii. 18) = *Adoniram* (1 Kin. iv. 6; v. 28), and = *Hadoram* (2 Chr. x. 18). He was not "rent-master" (Luther) [Eng. A. V., "over the tribute"], for the word (מַס) never † means "tribute, tax," but overseer of the public works or tribute-work [Germ. *frohn*, manorial work], a new office (not mentioned in viii. 16 sq.), the nature of which is indicated in 1 Kin. v. 27 sq. compared with 1 Kin. iv. 6. Adoram, put into this office in the latter years of David, held it till Rehoboam's time, 1 Kin. xii. 18. [The name *Adoram*, if it be correct (Sept., Syr., Arab. have *Adoniram*, Vulg. and Chald. as Heb.) must be considered an unusual contraction of the longer form; possibly it is an imitation (though an incorrect one) of such names as *Jehoram*.—Tr.]—4) *Jehoshaphat*, son of Ahilud was "chancellor" [Eng. A. V., less well: recorder]; see on viii. 16. —Ver. 25.—5) *Sheva* (or, Sheya) = *Seraiah* (viii. 17) was scribe or state-secretary.—6) *Zadok* and *Abiathar*, high-priests, viii. 17.—Ver. 26.—7) *Ira*, the Jairite, confidential *counsellor* to David, a new officer; in viii. 18 "sons of David" are said to have held this office. [The word here rendered "counsellor" (Eng. A. V.: "chief ruler") is the ordinary term for "priest," which rendering some would here retain. See on viii. 18 for the discussion of the meaning.—Tr.] Instead of "Jairite" Thenius (after Syr.) reads "Jattirite" (of Jattir), especially as this city Jattir in the mountains of Judah (Josh. xv. 48; xxi. 14) is mentioned in 1 Sam. xxx. 27 among those particularly friendly to David. But the rendering of the Syriac is derived from xxiii. 38 on account of the name *Ira* there found, which, however, represents a different person from this. Thenius, holding that the narrator wrote the history chaps. xi.–xx. in David's life-time, since he here breaks off without relating the history up to David's death, concludes from the way in which *Ira* is introduced ("and also Ira," etc.) that the author [Ira] here at the close appends his own name; but this latter assumption is unwarranted, even granting the other.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The *truthfulness* and *justice* of the theocratic historical narrative is shown, as everywhere in the frank statement of the sins of God's instruments, so here in the unveiled narration of David's errors in the way whereby God brought him back to his kingdom, and also of the unhappy results of his overhasty measures. His message to Judah, after he heard of Israel's preparations to bring him back (xix. ii. 12) was a mistake, since it was of such a nature as to kindle anew the fire of jealousy between the two sections of the people; he thereby put Judah before Israel (who had begun the movement for restoration), and the result was the violent *war of words*, xix. 41-43. His mistake in holding out to the rebel Amasa the certain prospect of the chief command, led to the murder of the latter by Joab. David had made Joab the companion and instrument of his crime against Uriah; and this community in crime was a collateral cause of the retention of the latter in the highest military office (xx. 23).

2. God the Lord, as king of His people, permits sin to work out its extremest evil consequences, in order to reveal His justice in the punishment of sin by sin, and in wise ways hidden from men to further the ends of His kingdom, by making human sin serviceable thereto. By *one* bad man the greater part of the nation is seduced into insurrection, after David had erred in looking too much to his own honor at his restoration, and regarding flesh and blood (xix. 12), neglecting to make *the Lord's honor* his highest point of view, and to subordinate everything to it. By the second sudden failure of his hopes, based on the popular favor, and his natural-fleshly relations to the people, he is to be brought again to know that the Lord alone is his strength, his protection and his help. The unjustly displaced Joab becomes a second time the saviour and restorer of the theocratic kingdom, striding over the corpse of the murdered ex-traitor to victory over the insurrection; whence David was to learn anew, that the ways of the Lord are not our ways, and His thoughts not our thoughts, and that He in *His* wisdom and might in the ways that *He* chooses and to the goal that *He* has fixed, performs things that in men's eyes, and through men's sins are most involved and confused.

3. The greatest confusion of affairs suddenly arises by the concatenation of various sins and crimes, just after the certain prospect of restoration to kingdom, and peace dawns on David. Jealous quarreling divides the people into two hostile parts. The king is powerless to extinguish the fire of anger and hatred. An insurgent quickly carries the greater part of the people off from David. Civil war once more rages throughout the whole nation. The army-leader appointed by the king is treacherously murdered by the unwisely aggrieved Joab. But in this confusion God's wisdom goes its quiet, hidden way, and His almighty hand leads the sorely tried king, who in this chaotic whirl, must see the consequences of his own errors, back to complete and triumphant royal dominion. While to men's eyes the co-operation of many evil powers seems to endanger the kingdom of God to the utmost, and its affairs appear to be confused and disturbed in the unhappiest fashion, the wonderful working of the living God reveals itself most gloriously in the unravelment of the worst entanglements, and in the introduction of new and unexpected triumphs for His government.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Chap. xix. 41–43. *Envy* and *jealousy* among God's people always *spring* from a passionate self-interest, which puts one's *own* honor in place of *God's* honor, and often, under the pretence of zeal for the one, makes the other the aim of all its striving;—they *produce* a *spiritual blinding* in which it becomes impossible to recognize God's

* הַכָּרִי, from כּוּר "to dig."

† [It seems to have this meaning in Esth. x. 1, but is commonly used as Dr. Erdmann says.—Tr.]

designs in the matters of His kingdom, an *embittering of hearts and minds*, whereby brotherly love is changed into hate, and a *rending* of the divinely joined *bonds of union*, from which follow wrangling, discord and party hostility.—[HENRY: If a good work be done, and well done, let us not be displeased, nor the work disparaged, though we had no hand in it.—TR.].—From hearts full of bitterness, and rancor flow evil words; these react upon the hearts of those who quarrel, and nurse the flame of hate and discord.—An unloving disposition ends in hard and injurious words; and from evil words it is but one step to evil deeds.

xx. 1. sq. The ambition of *one* man often pulls down what many with united forces have built up in a state, and may from *one spark* of discord kindle *a great fire* of uproar and insurrection, whereby a whole people is plunged into ruin.—The traitorous voice that leads to uprising against the divinely ordered authorities is followed by all that will not recognize in these authorities the ordination and action of God, and that have turned their hearts away from the living God.—OSIANDER: God tempers with a cross the prosperity of His elect, in order that they may be kept in His fear. Rom. v. 3 sq.—SCHLIER: David must learn from every new experience, what grief and heart-pain it brings to forsake the Lord and not fear Him. And assuredly David did recognize in all these chastisements that again and again broke over him, not merely the hand of men, but above all, the hand of the Lord.—STARKE: It is righteous in God to requite, and to measure with the measure wherewith we have measured, Luke vi. 38. [From HALL]: He had lift up his hand against a faithful subject; now a faithless dares to lift up his hand against him.—That is the way of the world: now it exalts one to heaven, now casts him down to earth; let us not then trust in men, but in God.

Ver. 3. SCHLIER: David well knew that nothing more surely and quickly brings in the Lord's help than to put away what is unbecoming. When trouble rises let us turn to the Lord, and put away what is an offence in His eyes, and cleanse heart and house of all that is displeasing to Him.

Ver. 4. The Lord forsakes not His people even when they make mistakes, and does not inflict on us the penalty even when we go astray.

Ver. 6. WUERT. B.: Pious men are not always steadfast and strong in faith, but amid assaults and trouble often grow pusillanimous, often as weak as if they had never met and withstood an assault. Then let us diligently pray: Lord, increase our faith.

Vers. 8–10. STARKE: The world is full of insidious courtesies and flatteries, a love-token is the sign and the design is to betray. Ps. lv. 22 [21].—HEDINGER [from HALL]: There is no enmity so dangerous, as that which comes masked with love. . . . . Thus spiritually deals the world with our souls, it kisses us and stabs us at once: if it did not embrace us with one hand, it could not murder us with the other.

Vers. 13–15. SCHLIER: From this we may learn how much a man that does his duty at the right time can perform; that which does most harm is not the evil men do, but their weakness in respect to doing good.—STARKE: Let the ungodly flee where they will, and seek shelter for themselves and their sins, yet the divine vengeance pursues them, Ps. cxxxix. 7.

Vers. 16, 17. Wisdom is better and mightier than all weapons. Prov. xi. 14. [HALL: There is no reason that sex should disparage, where the virtue and merit are no less than masculine. Surely the soul acknowledgeth no sex, neither is varied according to the outward frame. How oft have we known female hearts in the breasts of men, and contrarily manly powers in the weaker vessels.—TR.] Vers. 18, 19 CRAMER: The best bulwark of a city is, in addition to the true service of God, to hold fast its fidelity to the authorities, to study peace and avoid insurrection and revolt; for he who lives in innocence lives in safety. Prov. x. 9.—Vers. 20, 21. WUERT. B.: Often a single ungodly man can bring whole cities and churches into great distress and misfortune, and a single pious man can preserve them. Gen. xxxiv. 5; 1 Sam. xxii. 18. [HENRY: A great deal of mischief would be prevented, if contending parties would but understand one another. The city obstinately holds out, believing Joab aims at its ruin; Joab furiously attacks it, believing all its citizens confederates with Sheba; whereas both were mistaken; let both sides be undeceived, and the matter is soon accommodated.—TR.]—Ver. 22. He that takes the sword shall perish by the sword, Matt. xxvi. 52, and he that sets himself against the authorities deserves to pay the penalty with his life. Rom. xiii. 2. When we punish the wicked we should spare the innocent. Ezek. xviii. 20; Gen. xviii. 25.—Vers. 25, 26. OSIANDER: The counsellors of princes should be priests of righteousness, that is, should administer justice and righteousness.

[Vers. 1, 2. *Sheba the party-leader*. 1) The times call out the man. Envy, mutual reviling, repeated and increasing—only a leader wanted now. 2) There is always a wicked leader ready when wicked deeds are to be done. 3) Violent and reckless leaders often for a time gain a large following (ver. 2). 4) But at last they are apt to be selfishly abandoned (vers. 21, 22).—TR.]

[Vers. 16–22. *The peacemaker*. A worthy task for a "wise woman." 1) She approaches with great courtesy (vers. 16, 17). 2) She reminds how often wise counsel has ended strife (ver. 18). 3) She shows what evil would follow from the proposed violence (ver. 19). 4) Having obtained concessions on one side she goes to the other, wisely explaining, arguing, exhorting—and ends the conflict, so that no innocent blood is shed (vers. 20–22). Great is wisdom. Blessed are the peacemakers.—TR.]

THIRD DIVISION.

ECLECTIC APPENDIX TO THE CONCLUSION OF THE HISTORY OF DAVID'S REIGN.

CHAPS. XXI–XXIV.

FIRST SECTION.

Three Years' Famine on account of Saul's Crime against the Gibeonites, and Expiation of the Crime.

CHAP. XXI. 1–14.

1 THEN [And] there was a famine in the days of David three years, year after
year. And David inquired [sought the face][1] of the Lord [Jehovah]; and the
Lord answered [Jehovah said], *It is* for Saul and for *his* bloody house [for the
2 blood-guilty house[2]], because he slew the Gibeonites. And the king called the
Gibeonites, and said unto them; (now [and[3]] the Gibeonites were not of the chil-
dren of Israel, but of the remnant of the Amorites; and the children of Israel had
sworn unto them; and Saul sought to slay them in his zeal to the children of Israel
3 and Judah.) Wherefore [And] David said unto the Gibeonites, What shall I do
for you? and wherewith shall I make the atonement, that ye may bless the inheri-
4 tance of the Lord [Jehovah]? And the Gibeonites said unto him, We[4] will have
no silver nor gold of Saul, nor of his house; neither for us shalt thou kill any
5 man in Israel. And he said, What ye shall say, *that* will I do for you. And they
answered [said to] the king, The man that consumed us, and that devised against
us that we should be destroyed from remaining in any of the coasts [in any region]
6 of Israel, Let seven men of his sons be delivered[5] unto us, and we will hang them
up unto the Lord [Jehovah] in Gibeah of Saul, whom the Lord did choose [the
7 chosen of Jehovah[6]]. And the king said, I will give *them*. But [And] the king
spared Mephibosheth, the son of Jonathan, the son of Saul, because of the Lord's
[Jehovah's] oath that was between them, between David and Jonathan the son of

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 1. The phrase: "to seek the face" is simply "to go to one," while "to inquire of God" (דרשׁ באלהים) is "to investigate, seek wisdom" at His hands. The two verbs בקשׁ and דרשׁ are often coupled.—TR.]

[2] [Ver. 1. It is better to express in the translation the idea of "guilt" contained in the דָּמִים. Sept. renders: "on (עַל) Saul and on his house (בֵּיתוֹ) is iniquity [in death] of blood," where we may omit ἐν θανάτῳ and αὐτοῦ the הַדָּמִים being taken as subject and rendered: "iniquity of blood." Böttcher, Thenius and Wellhausen adopt this text, and render: "On Saul and on his house is blood-guiltiness." This translation avoids the hard expression: "the house of blood-guiltiness," where we should expect the possessive pronoun. On the other hand the אֶל — "concerning" (Eng. A. V.: "for") is a correct expression, and the hardness of the phrase is not unsuitable to an oracular response; the Heb. text is supported also by Vulg., Syr. and Chald.—TR.]

[3] [Ver. 2. Böttcher's view, that this parenthesis is a later insertion, may be correct, for ancient editors were accustomed to make such insertions. But there is no necessity for regarding it as an insertion (particularly, as a marginal gloss), because the Hebrew historical style permits such interposed remarks. Böttcher is unfortunate in charging a historical error on our text in that it has "Amorites" where Josh. ix. 1 sqq. has "Hivites;" for the name "Amorite" is sometimes a general one, given to the dwellers over a large area (see Art. *Amorite* in Smith's *Bib.-Dict.*). On the other hand Winer thinks that instead of "Hivites" in Josh. ix. 7 should be read "Amorite."—TR.]

[4] [Ver. 4. Properly: "There is not to us silver and gold with Saul and with his house, and there is not to us a man to kill in Israel," that is, as some (Thenius, Erdmann): "we have no right to these things," or, according to others (Böttcher, *Bib.-Com.*, Eng. A. V.): "we lay no claim to them."—The Qeri "to us" is better than the Kethib "to me."—TR.]

[5] [Ver. 6. The Kethib is Niph. Impf., the Qeri Hoph. Impf.—TR.]

[6] [Ver. 6. This phrase is a strange one, and various attempts have been made to amend the text. Three are mentioned by Erdmann; Wellhausen proposes another, to read "Gibeon" instead of "Gibeah," and to suppose

8 Saul. But [And] the king took the two sons of Rizpah the daughter of Aiab,
whom she bore unto Saul, Armoni and Mephibosheth, and the five sons of Michal
[Merab[7]] the daughter of Saul, whom she brought up for [bare to] Adriel the son
9 of Barzillai the Meholathite; And he [*om.* he] delivered them into the hands of
the Gibeonites, and they hanged them in the hill before the Lord [Jehovah]; and
they fell *all* seven together, and were put to death in the days of harvest, in the
10 first *days*, in the beginning of the barley-harvest.[8] And Rizpah the daughter of
Aiah took sackcloth, and spread it for her upon the rock, from the beginning of
the harvest until water dropped [poured] upon them out of heaven, and suffered
neither [not] the birds of the air to rest on them by day, nor the beasts of the field
11 by night. And it was told David what Rizpah the daughter of Aiah, the concu-
12 bine of Saul, had done. And David went and took the bones of Saul and the
bones of Jonathan his son from the men [citizens[9]] of Jabesh-gilead, which [who]
had stolen them from the street [square] of Beth-shan, where the Philistines had
13 hanged them, when the Philistines had slain Saul in Gilboa; And he brought up
from thence the bones of Saul and the bones of Jonathan his son; and they gathered
14 the bones of them that were hanged. And the bones of Saul and Jonathan his
son[10] buried they in the country [land] of Benjamin in Zelah in the sepulchre of
Kish his father; and they performed all that the king commanded. And after
that God was entreated [= listened to entreaties] for the land.

SECOND SECTION.

Accounts of Victorious Battles against the Philistines.

Vers. 15–22.

15 Moreover [And] the Philistines had yet [*om.* yet] war again with Israel; and
David went down, and his servants with him, and fought against the Philistines;
16 and David waxed faint. And Ishbi-benob,[11] which was of the sons of the giant,

the rest of the verse an insertion from the בהר of ver. 9. It is, however, impossible to say whether the Gibeonites would think Gibeon or Gibeah the fitter place for the execution, and the most natural emendation would seem to be to adopt the phrase of ver. 9, and read: "in Gibeah of Saul, in the mountain in the presence of Jehovah." The phrase: "mountain of Jehovah," would require us to suppose some particular mountain at Gibeah (or Gibeon) dedicated to Jehovah, and we do not know of such a one.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 8. "Michal" is clerical error for "Merab," perhaps, as Böttcher suggests, from the full form מירב.—The "brought up" of Eng. A. V. instead of "bare" is an unwarranted mistranslation, intended (after the Chaldee) to account for the name "Michal."—Tr.]

[8] [Ver. 9. As Sept. adds the word "barley" after "harvest" in ver. 10, Wellhausen would regard this last phrase in ver. 9 as a false repetition, especially as, if any preposition is to be supplied here, it would most naturally be כְּןְ (since the preceding word ends with ם—but the Qeri supplies בְּ), and this would not suit here. But the phrase is so natural a one that there is no good ground for rejecting it.—Böttcher's explanation of the Kethib שְׁעָבְתִּים as dual is accepted by Erdmann, though the resulting sense is not clear (see Ewald, § 269 b). The Qeri שְׁבַעְתָּם, "the seven of them" (Eng. A. V.: "all seven") seems better.—Tr.]

[9] [Ver. 12. The word בַּעַל occurs in the sense of "citizen" in the Books of Joshua, Judges and Samuel only. As it in such cases means (in the plural) "possessors of the city," it may throw light on the civil-political constitution of ancient city-life. It seems not to occur in this sense in any other Shemitic language.—Tr.]

[10] [Ver. 14. Sept. here inserts: "and the bones of the exposed" (= impaled, hanged), a very natural insertion (and adopted by Böttcher, Thenius and Wellhausen), but suspicious from its naturalness. Böttcher thinks that the words were purposely omitted in what he calls the "priestly recension" of the Book of Samuel, because offence was taken at the burial of those persons (who were slain as an expiation) along with Saul and Jonathan; against which Thenius remarks that the omission would have been very unwise in the face of the preceding narrative. But the bones of the seven may have been gathered at the same time with those of Saul and Jonathan without being interred in the same place with them.—Tr.]

[11] [Ver. 16. The strange form of this name has suggested emendations of the text. The Syriac (followed by its copyist the Arabic) omits it altogether, Vulg. and Chald. are as Heb., Sept. has Jesbi. Wellhausen proposes to read: וישבו בנב, "and they sat down in Gob" (taking *Nob* as error for *Gob*), and to place this after the "with him" in ver. 15; and in the וַיָּעַף דָּוִד he would see the name of the giant, and perhaps some verb, as "and he arose." The sentence would then read: "David went down and his servants with him, and they sat down [= took position] in Gob, and fought against the Philistines; and there arose [here the man's name], who was of the sons," *etc.* Similar to this is the emendation proposed in *Bib.-Com.*: "And David waxed faint. So they halted [= sat down] in Gob. And there was a man (in Gob), which was of the sons," *etc.*; instead of changing the "David waxed faint" (as Wellhausen does), this reading supplies the phrase: "and there was a man." These are both ingenious, and to both there are objections. The dislocation of a phrase supposed by Wellhausen is not accounted for; and in the other reading the statement that the man was in Gob is unnatural (since he was not residing there, but had come with the army), and David's weariness (which more naturally explains the giant's attack on him) is given merely as the reason for the army's halting. It is likely that the text is corrupt (and the corruption must have been made before the Sept. translation was made), the phrase: "David was weary" receives no explanation as it stands, and the ויאמר supposes another verb before it; but a satisfactory emendation has not yet been proposed, though Wellhausen's seems the least objectionable.—Instead of the second כְּמִשְׁקַל we should probably read שֶׁקֶל (so perhaps Sept.).—Tr.]

the weight of whose spear *weighed* [was] three hundred shekels of brass in weight
[*om.* in weight], he being girded with a new *sword*, thought to have slain David.
17 But [And] Abishai the son of Zeruiah succored him, and smote the Philistine and
killed him. Then the men of David sware unto him, saying, Thou shalt go no
18 more out with us to battle, that thou quench not the light of Israel. And it came
to pass after this, that there was again a battle with the Philistines at Gob; then
19 Sibbechai the Hushathite slew Saph, which was of the sons of the giant. And
there was again a battle in Gob with the Philistines, where [and] Elhanan[12] the
son of Jaare-oregim [Jair], a [the] Bethlehemite, slew *the brother of* [*om.* the brother of] Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam.
20 And there was yet a battle in Gath, where [and there] was a man of *great* stature,
that had on every [each] hand six fingers, and on every [each] foot six toes, four
21 and twenty in number; and he also was born to the giant. And when [*om.* when]
he defied Israel, [*ins.* and] Jonathan the son of Shimeah the brother of David slew
22 him. These four were born to the giant in Gath, and fell by the hand of David,
and by the hand of his servants.

[12] [Ver. 19. The text here is generally regarded as corrupt, the *oregim* being manifestly a repetition of the last word of the verse. Whether then we are to adopt the text of 1 Chron. xx. 5: "And Elhanan the son of Jair slew Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite," or to regard the latter as a conjectural emendation of ours, or, finally, to consider them both as corruptions of one original, it is hard to decide. Böttcher reads: "Elhanan the son of Jesse the Bethlehemite slew Goliath," *etc.*, and identifies Elhanan with David, on which see translator's note in the Exposition. Against the reading of "Chronicles" is the fact that it is the easier, against ours is the improbability of the existence of two Goliaths, or of the identity of Elhanan and David. But these presuppositions are all manifestly untrustworthy. See Erdmann's discussion in the Exposition, and for various other views see Poole's Synopsis.—Here and in ver. 18 some MSS. have *Nob* instead of *Gob*.—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

On the section Chs. xxi.-xxiv. and its relation to the preceding narration, see Introduction, p. 21 sqq. [Though Dr. Erdmann's statement of his view—that these chapters present six sections arranged in elaborate symmetry, from the point of view of theocratic historiography—is very ingenious, a comparison between these sections and similar ones in "Chronicles" and "Judges," makes it at least not improbable, that they constitute an appendix of materials for which no convenient place was found in the body of the history. This appendix is thus not accidental, is truly theocratic (since it gives various sides of David's character and life, as theocratic king), only has not the somewhat artificial arrangement that Dr. Erdmann proposes.—Tr.].

1. Ch. xxi. 1–14. *The three years' famine*, and the *expiation* of a crime committed by Saul against the Gibeonites.—Ver. 1. **In the days of David,** an indefinite phrase, which does not help us to fix the date of the following occurrence.* The mention of Mephibosheth in ver. 7 shows that it must be subsequent to the narrative of ch. ix., where David's first acquaintance with the young prince is described. It is to be put perhaps before Absalom's conspiracy (Ew.), since Shimei's words (xvi. 7, 8) may refer to the execution here narrated, though also to the deaths of Abner and Ishbosheth.—**And David sought the face of the Lord**—by prayer he endeavored to learn the cause of this judgment. The answer is given by the oracle [Urim and Thummim] consulted through the high-priest: "concerning Saul and the house of blood-guilt,"† the house on which rested blood-guiltiness; comp. the phrases "city of blood" Ezek. xxii. 2; xxiv. 6, 9, "man of blood" 2 Sam. xvi. 7, 8.—**Because he slew the Gibeonites,** a fact of which we have no account.* Ver. 2 states only the motive of this act of Saul.† The Gibeonites are here termed a remnant of the Amorites. According to Josh. ix. 3–27 an oath was sworn to these "Non-Israelites" that they should not be slain; comp. especially ver. 20. They are there called "Hivites," while here they are designated by the general name "Amorites" (Ew.), under which all the Canaanitish tribes are often embraced (Keil) [though in other cases the Amorites are distinguished as a separate tribe from the Hivites.—Tr.] **And Saul sought to slay them,** that is, to exterminate them. Thenius regards this statement as contradictory of the fact narrated [since he would not incur blood-guiltiness by merely *seeking* to slay them], and proposes to read "exterminate"‡ instead of "slay,"; but no contradiction exists, for, as Böttcher remarks, "it is intended in the words 'in his zeal' only to give the *motive* of the *attempt* [and it is not said that the attempt did not succeed.]." Saul's *zeal* "for the children of Israel and Judah"§ consisted in an attempt (in accordance with Deut. vii. 2, 24) to cleanse the Lord's people

* [The whole phrase rather indicates that the chronological order is here not observed (*Bib.-Com.*).—Tr.]
† Sept.: "on Saul and on his house is blood-guiltiness." See "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

* [Abarbanel (in Patrick) thinks they were slain when the priests were put to death (1 Sam. xxii.) in Nob; but there is no trace of this in the history.—Tr.]
† [The way in which this statement is introduced: "And the Gibeonites were not Israelites," shows not so much that the Book of Joshua was not a part of the same work as the Books of Samuel (*Bib. Com.*), as that the present Book of Joshua was not in existence when our narrative was written.—Tr.]
‡ לְהַכְרִיתָם instead of לְהַכֹּתָם.
§ [The word "Judah" is perhaps a later addition after the division of the kingdom, since the phrase "children of Israel" would in Saul and David's time include the whole nation.—Tr.]

from the remnant of the heathen, as He purified the land from the necromancers and soothsayers (1 Sam. xxviii. 3) according to the law. He thus "sought" to exterminate the Gibeonites, but his attempt did not succeed, as the presence of these Gibeonites shows. **Wherewith shall I appease?** namely, the anger of the Lord against this deed, comp. Josh. ix. 19, 20. "So that ye may then bless the Lord's inheritance," literally: "bless ye." The Imperative "is a curt and vigorous expression, indicating a certain result, a Future Imperative, as it were" (Ew. § 347 a).—Ver. 4. Literally: "there is not to me* silver and gold with Saul and with his house," that is, I have nothing to do with it, have no right to it, according to Numb. xxxv. 31. [They would not take money as compensation for murder. The custom of so compensating by money was common in ancient times, and its existence is supposed in the law above quoted. See Art. *Blood, Revenger of*, in Smith's *Bib.-Dict.*—Tr.]. **And we have no right to kill any one in Israel**, that is, it is not permitted us without more ado to execute blood-revenge for the murder of our people; their wrong, they thus intimate, must be expiated by blood, but they cannot proceed without the consent and command of the king.† The king's question: **What say ye then that‡ I shall do for you?** assumes the necessity of blood-expiation, and asks them to explain themselves more distinctly, since it is His duty thus to make expiation, and so relieve the land of the famine. [We may also render, as in Eng. A. V.: "what ye say, I will do."—Tr.].—Ver. 5. **As to the man§** (Saul) *that consumed us;* it appears, then, that Saul had broken the power of this tribe by his bath of blood. "And who devised against us, that we should be destroyed,‖ so as not to stand in all the territory of Israel." Comp. Josh. ix. 15, 26.—Ver. 6. The Apodosis. For the blood wrongfully shed by Saul, blood must flow from his house in return; according to Numb. xxxv. 31, 33 homicide was to be expiated by death [but the death of the murderer, not of his kindred; it is, however, intimated in ver. 1 that Saul's kindred had shared in the murderous act.—Tr.]. The execution was to be by hanging with extended limbs, crucifixion [impaling, so the term σταυρόω used for the crucifixion of Christ.—Tr.]. They demand *seven men* of Saul's sons. The sacred number seven is determined by the significance of this punishment, as work in the service of God, whereby God's wrath was to be appeased. They were to be hung up **to the Lord** (comp. ver. 9 "before the Lord," Numb. xxv. 4), in God's honor, to appease His anger, **in Gibeah of Saul**, because that was the home of Saul's house, on which the blood-guilt rested. **The anointed of the Lord** need not be regarded as "'holy irony" (Keil). Saul was really the anointed of the Lord; all the more must there be such expiation by blood to the Lord for his sin as *the Lord's Anointed.* Exception has been taken to this designation of Saul by non-Israelites, and various conjectures* made to set it aside: Böttcher makes the adjective plural: "we will hang them as the Lord's chosen ones" (after the Sept.); Houbigant [and Dathe]: "according to the word (oracular utterance) of the Lord;" Then., Ew. [*Bib.-Com.*]: "in the mountain of the Lord," the place of prayer on the mountain at Gibeah (1 Sam. x. 5); if any change is to be made, the last conjecture is preferable, because it demands only the dropping of a single letter.—David declares himself ready to satisfy this demand immediately.—Ver. 7. From the members of Saul's house he excepts only Mephibosheth on account of his oath to his father Jonathan (1 Sam. xviii. 3; xx. 8, 16; xxiii. 18).—Ver. 8. Members of Saul's house doomed to death: **two sons of Rizpah**†, Saul's concubine (comp. ver. 11 and iii. 7), and **five sons of Merab**. The name *Michal* in our text is obviously a copyist's error, for Saul's oldest daughter, given in marriage to the Meholathite Adriel of Abel-Meholah in Issachar, and named *Merab*, 1 Sam. xviii. 19. The Chald. has: "the sons of Merab, whom Michal had brought up," a baseless attempt to retain the text-reading. [This is followed by Eng. A. V. Render: sons of Merab, whom she bare to Adriel.—Tr.].—Ver. 9. **And they crucified them on the mountain**, namely, near Gibeah (1 Sam. x. 5) **before the Lord**, at the place there devoted to the worship of God, which was indicated by an altar. Retaining the text‡, render: "they fell sevenfold at once," that is, "by sevens, in the same manner" (as the Dual denotes). [This rendering of the Kethib or text: "by sevens" is not appropriate here, since there was only one "seven," and it is better to adept the Qeri or margin: "the seven of them" (Philippson) or "all seven" (Eng. A. V., Cahen).—Tr].—The execution occurred *at the time of the harvest§* (Keil, *Bib. Arch.* II. § 118, Winer I. 340 [Smith's *Bib.-Dict.*, Art. *Agriculture*]). This chronological statement serves to define the following procedure of Rizpah (Thenius).—Ver. 10. Touching picture of Rizpah's maternal grief.

* The Kethib Sing. "to me" (indicating the one person speaking for all) is to be preferred to the Qeri Plu. "to us" [as in Eng. A. V.], which is an imitation of the following "to us."

† [According to others (*Bib.-Com.*) their meaning is that it is not against the nation Israel, but against the individual Saul, that they cry for vengeance, which is better.—Tr.]

‡ כִּי is omitted before the Imperf., as sometimes occurs when the dependent sentence expresses a process or obligation; comp. Lev. ix. 6; Ew. § 336 *b*.

§ הָאִישׁ is asyndetically preposed Accus. Absolute, defined by "his sons" in ver. 6. Ges. § 145, 2.

‖ נִשְׁמַדְנוּ depends on דִּמָּה with omission of כִּי. It is unnecessary to supply the ו consec of the Perfect, (Then.), or to read לְהַשְׁמִידֵנוּ (Ew., Böttcher).

* Böttch.: בִּחִירֵי; Houb.; בִּדְבַר; Then.: בְּהַר. [See "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

† [*Bib Com.* suggests that, as *Aiah* occurs as a [masculine] Horite name (in Gen. xxxvi. 24), Rizpah may have been a foreigner, and this may have been the reason for selecting her sons as victims.—Tr.]

‡ Kethib.: שִׁבְעָתַיִם is with Böttcher to be retained against the Qeri שִׁבְעָתָּם, since the Dual properly denotes what is repeated *in equal measure* according to the number (Böttcher).

§ תְּחִלַּת (not Qeri with בְּ) is adverbial Accusative; Ges. § 118, 2.

She took the sackcloth, a rough, hairy cloth used in mourning (the Art. points out that it was the cloth usual on such occasions) **and spread it out on the rock**, for a bed for herself; she wished to remain all the time by the corpses, in order to protect them against beasts and birds; it was regarded as the greatest disgrace for corpses to be left unburied, a prey to ravenous birds and beasts, 1 Sam. xvii. 44.—The law (Deut. xxi. 22 sq.) that the hanged were not to be left overnight on the stake, but to be buried before the evening, did not apply here, because the exhibition of the executed persons as a propitiatory offering was necessary till the appearance of the sign that the plague had ceased. **From the beginning of harvest till water poured down on them from heaven**, *i. e.*, the bodies hung till rain descended on the parched land as sign that God's anger was appeased. The text says neither that the rain came *immediately* after the execution (Josephus, Cler., Ew., Böttcher), nor that it did not come till the usual rain-season, October (Thenius). [We therefore do not know how long Rizpah kept her watch.—Tr.]—Vers. 11–14. Hearing* of Rizpah's touching care of the bodies, David provided for their burial together with the bones of Saul and Jonathan, which for this purpose he caused to be brought from Jabesh in Gilead. [He thus honored the maternal faithfulness and showed that he cherished no ill-will against the house of Saul (Patrick).—Tr.].—Ver. 12. [David takes part personally in the matter]. He took the bones of Saul and Jonathan **from the citizens of Jabesh**, see 1 Sam. xxxi. 8 sq. *There* it is said (ver. 10) that the Philistines fastened the corpses on the *wall* of Bethshan. This is not contradicted by the statement *here* that the Jabeshites had stolen the corpses (*i. e.*, taken them away secretly) from the *square;* for this "public square" (רְחֹב) is not the market-place in the middle of the city, but the open place at or before the gate (2 Chr. xxxii. 6; Neh. viii. 1, 3, 16), where the people were accustomed to assemble, and where they might see the bodies hung† on the wall.—"When (בְּיוֹם) the Philistines had slain Saul," not "on the day when," but "at the time," since (1 Sam. xxxi. 8 sqq.) the hanging up of the corpses did not take place till the day after the battle.—Ver. 14. They buried **the bones of Saul and Jonathan**; from ver. 13 we must suppose that the bones of the seven executed men were also buried. [Sept. adds: "and the bones of the hanged," which some critics insert in the Hebrew text; Dr. Erdmann thinks the insertion unnecessary, because the fact would be taken for granted. But it is not clear that the bones of the seven were interred along with those of Jonathan and Saul: they may have been put into a separate sepulchre.—Tr.]—**In Zelah**; the locality of this city is unknown. Comp. Josh. xviii. 28.

2. Vers. 15–22. *Individual heroic deeds in the Philistine wars.* This chronicle-like section (and so the similar section xxiii. 8–39) is probably taken from a writing that contained a historical-statistical collection of David's wars and of the exploits of his warriors. As the three deeds here described (vers. 18–22) are attached in 1 Chr. xx. 4–8 to the history of the Ammonite-Syrian war (comp. xii. 26–31), this collection may be conjectured to belong to a fuller chronicle of David's wars, to which may have belonged also the sections v. 17–25; viii. 1–14; x. 1–9; xii. 26–31, in which the wars against the Philistines and other nations are narrated.

a. Vers. 15–17. *Exploit of Abishai* in a new war against the Philistines. The "again" cannot possibly refer chronologically to the immediately preceding narrative, but indicates that the following is a fragment from a history of Philistine wars. Comp. the "again" in v. 22. Probably this fragment belongs chronologically in the group v. 18–25, in favor of which is the fact that David is here already king of all Israel, since he is called (ver. 17) the "light of Israel." Comp. v. 1–3.—**And David was weary.** A Philistine giant essayed to take advantage of this weariness of David, and kill him. His name was *Ishbobenob*, not *Ishbo* at *Nob* (De Wette), "for neither the fact that he was *born* at *Nob*, nor that the incident *occurred at Nob* (there is no *third* supposition) could be *so* expressed" (Thenius). The name (not to be read with Vulg. [and Eng. A. V.] Jisbibenob) perhaps means: "the dweller on the height" (Gesen.); he probably lived on a high, inaccessible rock. [The name, which has a strange appearance, is probably a corrupt reading, but it is difficult to restore the text. See "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]—**Who belonged to the scions of the Rapha**, one of the giant-race of the *Raphaites* [Rephaim], who formed part of the primitive inhabitants of Canaan, comp. Gen. xiv. 5; xv. 20; Deut. ii. 11, 20; iii. 11, 13; Josh. xii. 4; xiii. 12. The name *the Rapha*, "the giant" designates the ancestor of this race. [Rather the name *Harapha* seems here to designate simply the father of the four giants here mentioned, since it is said (ver. 22) that they were born to him in Gath. On the old races of Canaan see Art. *Giants* in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*—Tr.) The brazen head* of his lance weighed three hundred shekels, = eight pounds, half the weight of Goliath's, 1 Sam. xvii. 7.—**He was girded with a new suit of armor**—so with Böttcher we are to take the Feminine Adjective (חֲדָשָׁה "new") in a collective sense; comp. Judg. xviii. 11; Deut. i. 41. [The Heb. has: "he was girt with a new," to which Eng. A. V. supplies *sword;* Philippson renders as Böttcher: "he was newly armed," and Wellhausen suggests that the word means not "new," but some weapon, not otherwise known.—Tr.] "And he thought [= purposed] to smite David" (Ew. § 338 a).—Ver. 17. Abishai inter-

* On the construction of וַיָּגֶר with אֶת see Ges. § 143, 1 *a*. [According to Gesenius the אֶת here introduces the Accusative of limitation; according to others (not so well) the Nominative.—Tr.]

† Kethib תְּלוּם is the Heb. form (from תָּלָה), the Qeri תְּלָאוּם the Aramaising form; see Ges. § 75, 22; Ew. § 252 *a*.—Instead of Keth. שָׁם הַפְּ׳ read Qeri שָׁמָּה פְּ׳ the Art. being out of place before פְּ׳.

* קֵינוֹ—*ferrum hastæ* (Vulg).

posed, and slew * the giant. Thereupon the men of Israel swore that David should not go into battle with them. **Thou shalt not quench the light of Israel**, thou shalt not abandon thyself to death, and so quench the light and well-being that the Lord has given Israel in thee. On the designation of David as *the light of Israel*, comp. xxii. 29 and Ps. xviii. 29 (28).

b. Ver. 18. The exploit of the Hushathite *Sibbechai*. Comp. 1 Chr. xx. 4. On Sibbechai, one of David's heroes (1 Chr. xi. 29) comp. 1 Chr. xxvii. 11, where he is mentioned as leader of the eighth army-division. On "the Hushathi" as patronymic from Hushah comp. 1 Chr. iv. 4. [The "Mebunnai" of 2 Sam. xxiii. 27 is probably (see Dr. Erdmann's note there) corruption for "Sibbechai."—Tr.].—Instead of *Gob*, an unknown place, the chronicler has *Gezer*, which Thenius adopts here. But as *Gob* is mentioned also in ver. 19 it is better to suppose (Keil) that Gob was perhaps a small place near *Gezer*, the old Canaanitish royal city (Josh. x. 32; xii. 12). Perhaps the name may be recognized in *El Kubab* on the road from Ramleh to Yalo [Rob. III. 143, 144].—Saph = *Sippai* of Chron., which is the "older form" (Böttcher).

c. Ver. 19. The exploit of *Elhanan*. He is called **the son of Jaare-oregim**. 1 Chr. xx. 5 has "son of *Jair*" without the "Oregim." This latter is here evidently a repetition by error from the following line. Further, instead of "*Elhanan the Bethlehemite* slew *Goliath*," Chron. has "Elhanan slew *Lahmi the brother of Goliath*." † The question is, whether our text gives the original reading, and Chron. has changed it (Berth., Böttch., Ew., Then., the last against his former view), or Chron. has the original and our text has been changed (Piscator, Cler., Mich., Movers, formerly Then., Keil). In the former case, the change of text in Chron. is attributed to the difficulty felt in the statement that Elhanan killed a giant Goliath, in connection with David's combat with Goliath (1 Sam. xvii.), it being maintained that our text could not have originated from that of Chron. But the supposition of a designed falsification of text by the Chronicler is to be rejected so long as the origination of our text admits of explanation. If the above-mentioned error [insertion of *Oregim*] crept into our text even in the statement of Elhanan's descent, this favors the conjecture that the following words also (given correctly in Chron.) have undergone change. Now there is an Elhanan *of Bethlehem*, who is mentioned among David's army-leaders, xxiii. 24 (comp. 1 Chr. xi. 26). When the error above-mentioned had gotten in, the result might easily be that a transcriber thinking of the Elhanan of xxiii. 24, would add the local designation *Bethlehemite*, and, having in mind the verbal agreement of the descriptions of *Lahmi's* spear and Goliath's (1 Sam. xvii. 7), would change the "brother of Goliath" into "Goliath." Further, it is not probable that there were *two* giants named *Goliath*. As for the view that vers. 19, 21 "contain the true old model of the elaborate description in 1 Sam. xvii." (Then.), and that the latter (notwithstanding the historical fact that underlies it), has, it may be conjectured, borrowed especially the giant's name from these verses (Ew., Then.)—against this is that (apart from the mention here of *two* giants, and the description of the giant in ver. 20, which does not suit the Goliath of 1 Sam. xvii.) neither in ver. 19 or ver. 21 is *David* named as the victorious warrior, but *two* heroes, Elhanan and Jonathan, are the conquerors. [The old opinion (Chald.: "and David, son of Jesse the veil-weaver of the sanctuary, of Bethlehem, killed Goliath," and so Rashi) that Elhanan is *David*, is adopted and pressed by Bött., who renders: "and Elhanan, son of Jesse, killed Goliath." After referring to the fact that a man often had two names, he gives six reasons for his identification of Elhanan and David: 1) the mention of David in ver. 22 can not, he says, be otherwise explained.—But see note on ver. 17, and, further, this insertion of David does not necessarily imply more than a general sharing by him in the exploits. 2) Two other sons of Jesse have names containing *El*.—This proves nothing for the remaining sons. 3) Persons ill-disposed towards David call him simply "son of Jesse" (Ben-Jesse), having forgotten his old name (Elhanan), and avoiding his later, happier name (David). Here that an earlier name was forgotten is assumed without a shadow of evidence. 4) In our passage, something must have stood in the place of the corrupt *Oregim*, and what can it have been but: "he is David" (הוּא דוד)?—There is no need to suppose that anything stood there. 5) In xxiii. 24 we find: "Elhanan the son of Dodo," which, says Böttcher, is for "Elhanan, son of David," and this (combining 1 Chron. xi. 26) is for: "Elhanan, son of Jesse, he is David of Bethlehem."—But the change of *Dodo* into *David* is unwarranted, and the rest arbitrary. 6) The text of Chron. is corrupt, for ours could not have come from it.—Thus Böttcher builds his opinion on a series of arbitrary assumptions. As Thenius remarks, this sudden and isolated change of name (from David to Elhanan) would be in the highest degree strange and misleading.—The text is difficult, and no satisfactory account of it has been given. All that is clear is that Elhanan killed a giant. See "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

d. Vers. 20, 21. The exploit of *Jonathan*, David's nephew. There was again a battle with the Philistines *in Gath*. According to the text* probably: "there was a man of measures, extensions" [Eng. A. V.: of great stature], so De Dieu, Maurer, Movers, Ew., § 177 *a*. Bertheau and Thenius render: "a man of length;" Böttcher: "a man of strife," a quarrelsome fellow, bully. **Six fingers and six toes**, an abnormity that has always occurred, and still occurs. Pliny

* [Patrick would render: "Abishai helped him, and he (David) slew the Philistine," in order to explain the mention of David in ver. 22. The Heb. does not certainly decide this point, but more probably Abishai is said to be the slayer.—Tr.]

† Sam.: בֵּית הַלַּחְמִי אֵת גָּלְיָת; Chron.: אֶת־לַחְמִי אֲחִי גָּלְיָת.

* Kethib: מָדִין probably = מִדִּין, as archaic or Aramaic Plural (for which Chron. has Sing. מִדָּה), "extensions;" Berth. and Then. take Qeri מָדוֹן (= מִדָּה of Chron), "length;" Böttcher: Kethib מָדִין = מָדוֹן "contention."

(*Hist. Nat.* XI. 43) mentions *sedigiti*, six-fingered Romans.—Ver. 21. He was killed by Jonathan, son of Shimea (called Shimeah in xiii. 3, and Shammah in 1 Sam. xvi. 9), Jesse's third son.—[In our text he is called Shimei, in the margin Shimea.—Tr.]

Ver. 22. Concluding remark. **These four.** Literally: "as to these four (Accus.), they were the scions of the *Rapha*," descendants of the race of Rephaim at Gath, remains of the pre-Canaanitish inhabitants, distinguished by their gigantic size. See Josh. xi. 22.—The phrase: "by the hand of David," refers, not to his personal conflict with Ishbobenob, ver. 16 (Then., Keil), but to the fact that his heroes killed these giants under him as commander.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The blood-guilt that Saul had brought on his house by slaying the Gibeonites was produced by his perverted zeal for the purity of God's people and for the Lord's honor; the means he chose thereto were violation of oath (Josh. ix.) and murder. The result of this crime of the king of Israel, the representative of the people of God, was God's wrath on the land announced in the famine. A dark shadow here passes from Saul's time over into David's, in the account of which the following fundamental thoughts are interwoven. 1) Zeal for the Lord and His cause must not be conjoined with sin; if the good end makes holy the bad means, the bad means makes unholy and void the good end. 2) God's anger cannot fail against crime committed in ostensible zeal for the honor of His kingdom; in men's eyes the evil may assume the appearance of the alleged holy end, in God's eyes the evil impulses in the human heart are evident; the punishment may delay, but comes in its time in all its severity. 3) He who sheds man's blood, by man shall His blood be shed (Gen. ix. 5, 6), because man is made in God's image, and murder is therefore a crime against the holy God Himself. Such a crime Saul committed against the Gibeonites, for the law of extermination did not apply to them (Josh. ix.), and if they were not members of God's people, they were men, made in God's image. 4) Saul's guilt becomes also the guilt of his house and people. The land must expiate its king's wrong. This is rooted in the idea of the solidarity of the people and the theocratic king as representative of God's people, whence comes solidarity of guilt between king and people. If through the fault of an individual member of the theocratic people, the whole theocratic State is unhallowed and exposed to God's anger, how much more must this be the result of a sin committed by their king. [Kitto: If it be asked—and it has been asked—why vengeance was exacted rather for this slaughter of the Gibeonites, than for Saul's greater crime, the massacre of the priests at Nob?—the answer is, that the people, and even the family of Saul, had no sympathy with or part in this latter tragedy, which none but an alien could be found to execute. But both the people and Saul's family had made themselves parties in the destruction of the unhappy Gibeonites, by their sympathy, their concurrence, their aid—and above all, as we must believe, by their accepting the fruits of the crime. Yet, although this be the intelligible public ground on which the transaction rests, it is impossible to withhold our sympathy for these victims of a public crime in which it is probable that none of them had any direct part.—Tr.]

2. *Blood-vengeance* was ordered in the Law only in case of *intentional* killing. The fundamental law is given in Gen. ix. 5, 6; the preciser statements are made in Ex. xxi. 12–14; Numb. xxxv. 9–34; Deut. xix. 1–13. The Lord is the proper avenger of blood, Gen. ix. 5, 6; Ps. ix. 13 [1]; [Rom. xii. 19]. And no other means of absolution or expiation may be substituted for the blood of the guilty. Numb. xxxv. 31. For the intentional murderer there is no protection against blood-vengeance, not even at the altar, Ex. xxi. 14—in such case only the blood of the slayer can atone. And so in consequence of this crime Saul was exposed to blood-vengeance according to the divine Law.

3. According to the law, blood-vengeance was to be executed only on the *criminal himself.* "The legislation of the middle books of the Pentateuch [Ex., Lev., Numb.] never permits the avenger of blood to go beyond the murderer, and seize his family" (Oehler in Herzog, II. 262). Comp. 2 Sam. xiv. 6–11. When the Gibeonites demanded *seven descendants* of Saul (who was fallen under the divine judgment) David was under no legal obligation to yield to the demand. When now he *nevertheless* yielded, and no complaint was made against him, this points to the fact that *custom* had originated a *practice* going beyond the law, based on the oriental notion of the *solidarity of the family*, and on the idea (found in the law) of *guilt inherited* by children from parents—and that David acted in accordance with this practice; the words of Deut. xxiv. 16 (comp. 2 Kings xiv. 6), as supplement to earlier legislation, may be directed against this practice (Oehler, as above, Kleinert on Deuteronomy, 1872, p. 133). Kurtz (Herz. III. 305): "David yields to their request, and the persons delivered up are hanged. To understand this procedure, we must bear in mind the ancient oriental ideas of the solidarity of the family, strict retaliation and blood-vengeance, ideas that, with some limitation, remained in force in the legislation of the Old Covenant." [David certainly did wrong, if he yielded to a mere custom against the prescriptions of the law; the custom was a cruel one. Nothing is said in the text, indeed, about a conflict between custom and law; it seems strange that neither priest nor prophet raises his voice against a public crime. But the brevity of the account withholds the circumstances that might throw light on the incident.—Tr.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 1 sq. Schlier: A famine in the land is a sign of the divine wrath. The Lord our God has every thing in His hand, even natural phenomena depend on Him; even dew and rain come from Him. [Hall: Justly it is presupposed by David that there was never judgment from God where hath not been a provocation from men; therefore, when he sees the plague, he inquires for the sin. Never man smarted cause-

lessly from the hand of divine justice. O that, when we suffer, we could ask what we have done, and could guide our repentance to the root of our evils.—Tr.]—J. Lange: God does indeed put off His judgments; but He does not therefore annul them, Exod. xxxii. 34. [Henry: Time does not wear out the guilt of sin; nor can we build hopes of impunity upon the delay of judgments. There is no statute of limitation to be pleaded against God's demands. ..... Let parents take heed of sin, especially the sin of cruelty and oppression, for their poor children's sake, who may be smarting for it by the just hand of God, when they are in their graves. Guilt and a curse are a bad entail upon a family.—Tr.]

Fr. Arndt: A secret judgment of God goes through history, and he who is spared by time is certainly judged by eternity. That so many years lie between the sin and the punishment, and the expiation comes not in Saul's, but in David's time, is only a sign of the divine patience. God often waits long before He punishes; He not seldom makes the whole life a day of grace, and only in the day of judgment, long, long after the guilt was incurred, does the threatened punishment begin.—Osiander: It often happens that God in His righteous judgment visits a wicked man's great sins not on him, but on His posterity.—Hall: Every sin hath a tongue, but that of blood over-cries and drowns the rest, Gen. iv. 10.—Osiander: A common prayer and a common curse have very great power; for the sighing of them that suffer violence pierces through the clouds and draws divine vengeance. Ecclus. xxxv. [xxxii.] 21-23.—Fr. Arndt: There are also well-founded complaints against us, occasioned by our behaviour, and woe to us if as secret and frightful accusers against us they go up before God's throne of judgment. [Hall: Little did the Gibeonites think that God had so taken to heart their wrongs, that for their sakes all Israel should suffer. Even when we think not of it is the Righteous Judge avenging our unrighteous vexations.—Tr.]

Vers. 6 sq. Schlier: Our time does indeed think of the rights of the criminal; but of the rights of those whom the criminal maltreats or threatens, people no longer think much, and still less do they think now-a-days of duty towards the criminal himself.—Ver. 9. Mercy and righteousness do not exclude each other. He who fears God should exhibit both at the same time righteousness in mercy, and also mercy in righteousness.—[Vers. 10, 11. "One touch of nature makes the whole world kin." The king is moved by the lowly mother's devotion. The passage, vers. 1-14, is impressively treated by Taylor.—Tr.]

Vers. 15 sq. *The conflict of the world-power against God's kingdom* is 1) A continual conflict, ever again renewed; 2) A conflict carried on with malicious cunning, frightful power and mighty weapons; 3) A conflict perilous to the people of God, demanding all the power given them by the Lord and their utmost bravery; 4) A conflict that by God's help at last ends in the victory of His kingdom.

[Vers. 1-3. *The solidarity of human society* (comp. above, "Hist. and Theol.," No. 3). 1) As to guilt. 2) As to punishments. 3) As to expiations.—Ver. 14. "And after that God was entreated for the land." *Reparation of wrong-doing a condition of being heard in prayer.*—Tr.]

THIRD SECTION.

David's song of thanksgiving for the victories that the Lord gave him over his enemies through his deeds of might.

Chapter XXII.

1 And David spake unto the Lord [Jehovah] the words of this song in the day
that the Lord (Jehovah) had delivered him out of the hand of all his enemies, and
2 out of the hand of Saul: And he said,
The Lord [Jehovah] is my rock, and my fortress, and my deliverer,
3 The God of my rock [My Rock-God], in him will [*om.* will] I trust,
He is [*om.* he is] my shield and the horn of my salvation, my high tower [fortress], and my refuge,
My Saviour, thou savest me from violence.
4 I will [*om.* will] call on the Lord [Jehovah] *who is* worthy to be praised,
So shall I [And I shall] be saved from mine enemies.
5 When [For] the waves of death compassed me,
The floods of ungodly men [streams of wickedness] made me afraid,
6 The sorrows [toils] of hell [Sheol] compassed me about,
The snares of death prevented [encountered] me.

7 In my distress I called upon the Lord [Jehovah],
And cried to my God [And to my God I cried],
And he did hear [heard] my voice out of his temple [palace],
And my cry *did enter* [*entered*] into his ears.
8 Then [And] the earth shook and trembled,
The foundations of heaven [the heavens] moved
And shook, because he was wroth.
9 There went up a smoke out of [in] his nostrils
And fire out of his mouth devoured,
Coals were kindled by it [Red-hot coals burned from him].
10 He bowed the heavens also [And he bowed the heavens], and came down,
And darkness [cloud-darkness] was under his feet.
11 And he rode upon a cherub, and did fly,
And he was seen [And appeared] upon the wings of the wind.
12 And he made darkness pavilions round about him,
Dark waters [Gathering of waters], *and* [*om.* and] thick clouds of the skies.
13 Through [Out of] the brightness before him
Were coals of fire kindled [Burned coals of fire].
14 The Lord [Jehovah] thundered from heaven,
And the Most High uttered his voice.
15 And he sent out arrows, and scattered them,
Lightning, and discomfited them.
16 And the channels [beds] of the sea appeared,
The foundations of the world [earth] were discovered
At the rebuking of the Lord [Jehovah],
At [By] the blast of the breath of his nostrils.
17 He sent [reached] from above [on high], he took me,
He drew me out of many [great] waters.
18 He delivered me from my strong enemy,
And [*om.* and] from them that hated me, for they were too strong for me.
19 They prevented [came upon] me in the day of my calamity,
But the Lord [And Jehovah] was my stay.
20 He brought me forth also [And he brought me forth] into a large place,
He delivered me, because he delighted in me.
21 The Lord [Jehovah] rewarded [rendered] me according to my righteousness,
According to the cleanness of my hands hath he recompensed me.
22 For I have kept the ways of the Lord [Jehovah],
And have not wickedly departed from my God.
23 For all his judgments *were* [are] before me,
And *as for* his statutes I did [do] not depart from them.
24 I was also [And I was] upright before [perfect towards] him,
And have kept myself from my iniquity.
25 Therefore the Lord [And Jehovah] hath recompensed me according to my righteousness,
According to my cleanness in his eyesight.
26 With the merciful thou wilt show [showest] thyself merciful,
And [*om.* and] with the upright [perfect] man thou wilt show [showest] thyself upright [perfect].
27 With the pure thou wilt show [showest] thyself pure,
And with the froward [perverse] thou wilt show [showest] thyself unsavory [perverse].
28 And the afflicted people thou wilt save [savest],
But [And] thine eyes are upon [against] the haughty, *that* thou mayest bring *them* down.
29 For thou art my lamp, O Lord [Jehovah],
And the Lord [Jehovah] will lighten [lightens] my darkness.
30 For by thee I have run [I run] through a troop [troops],
By my God have I leaped over [I leap over] a wall [walls].

31 *As for* God, his way is perfect;
The word of the Lord [Jehovah] is tried [pure],
He is a buckler to all them that trust in him.
32 For who is God save the Lord [Jehovah]?
And who is a rock save our God?
33 God is my strength and power [strong fortress].
And he maketh my way perfect.
34 He maketh my feet like hinds' *feet* (like the hinds),
And setteth me upon my high places.
35 He teacheth my hands to war,
So that [And] a bow of steel is broken by mine arms [my arms bend a bow of bronze].
36 Thou hast also [And thou hast] given me the shield of thy salvation,
And thy gentleness [hearkening] hath made me great.
37 Thou hast enlarged my steps under me,
So that [And] my feet did not slip [my ankles did not tremble].
38 I have pursued mine enemies, and destroyed them,
And turned not again until I had consumed them.
39 And I have consumed them, and wounded [crushed] them,
That [And] they could [did] not arise,
Yea [And] they are fallen under my feet.
40 For [And] thou hast girded me with strength to battle,
Them that rose up against me hast thou subdued under me.
41 Thou hast also [And thou hast] given me the necks of mine enemies,
That I might destroy [And I destroyed] them that hate [hated] me.
42 They looked, but there was none to save [and there was no saviour],
Even [*om.* even] unto the Lord [Jehovah], but [and] he answered them not.
43 Then did [And] I beat them as small as the dust of the earth,
I did stamp [crushed] them as the mire of the street, *and* [*om.* and] did spread them abroad [stamped them].
44 Thou also [And thou] hast delivered me from the strivings of my people,
Thou hast kept me *to be* head of the heathen,
A people *which* I knew not, shall [*om.* shall] serve me.
45 Strangers shall submit themselves unto me [Strangers fawn on me],
As soon as they hear, they shall be [are] obedient unto me.
46 Strangers shall fade away,
And they shall be afraid out of their close places [strongholds].
47 The Lord [Jehovah] liveth, and blessed *be* my rock,
And exalted be the God of the rock of my salvation.
48 *It is* God [The God] that avengeth me,
And that [*om.* that] bringeth down the people [peoples] under me,
49 And that [*om.* that] bringeth me forth from mine enemies,
Thou also [And thou] hast lifted me up on high above them that rose up against me [hast exalted me above my adversaries],
Thou hast delivered me from the violent man.
50 Therefore will I give thanks unto thee, O Lord [Jehovah], among the heathen,
And I will sing praises unto thy name.
51 *He is* the tower of salvation for his king,
And showeth mercy to his Anointed,
Unto [To] David and to his seed for evermore.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

This *song of praise and thanksgiving* is (a few deviations excepted, which will be examined in the exposition) identical with *Ps. xviii.* The *superscription* is substantially the same in the two productions. In the Psalm the opening words: "to the precentor, by the servant of Jehovah, by David," are like the title of Ps. xxxvi.; then follows (in the form of a relative sentence: "who spake to Jehovah") the *historical introduction* in the same words as in ver. 1 of our chapter (except only that the second "hand" is given by different words): "And David spake to the Lord the words of this song," *etc.* The *Davidic origin*

of the song, which is *universally recognized* (except by Olshausen and Hupfeld) is thus doubly attested. The redactor of our Books regards this as equally indubitable as in the other sayings and poems attributed to David, iii. 33, 34; v. 8; vii. 18–29; xxiii. 1–7. The high antiquity of the song is favored by its use in Ps. cxvi., cxliv., and the quotation of ver. 31 in Prov. xxx. 5, and of ver. 34 in Hab. iii. 19; and especially the early recognition of its Davidic origin is shown by the fact that the author of the Books of Samuel found the superscription, which ascribes the song to David, already in the *historical authority* whence he took the narrative (comp. Hitzig on *Psalms*, I. 95 sqq.). The *source*, whence Ps. xviii. also with its identical historical introduction was taken into the psalter (since it was evidently not taken from 2 Sam.) is doubtless one of the theocratic-prophetic historical works, from which Sam. has drawn. See the Introduction, pp. 31–35. The *content* also of the song puts its genuineness beyond doubt. The *victories* that God has given the singer over internal and external enemies, so that he is now a mighty king, the individual *characteristics*, which agree perfectly with the Davidic Psalms, and especially the singer's designation of himself by the name *David* (ver. 51), compel us to regard the latter as the author. "Certainly," says Hitzig, "this opinion will be derived from ver. 51. And rightly; for, if the song was not by David, it must have been composed in his name and into his soul; and who could this contemporary and equal poet be?"—On the *position of the song in this connection* midway among the sections of the concluding appendix, see Introduction, pp. 21–23. The insertion of the episodes from the Philistian wars (xxi. 15–22) gives the point of connection for the introduction of this song of victory, which David sang in triumph over his external enemies. And the reference at the close of this song (ver. 51) to the promise of the everlasting kingdom (2 Sam. vii. 12–16, 26, 29), which David now sees is assured by his victories, has obviously given the redactor the point of connection for David's last prophetic song (xxiii. 1–7), wherein is celebrated the imperishable dominion of his house, founded on the covenant that the Lord has made with him. Noticeable also is the bond of connection between the two songs in the fact that David calls himself by name in ver. 51 and xxiii. 1 just as in vii. 20. —*The time of composition* (the reference in ver. 51 to 2 Sam. vii. being unmistakable) cannot be before the date when David, on the ground of the promise given him through Nathan, could be sure that his dominion despite all opposition was immovable, and that the throne of Israel would remain forever with his house. The words of the title: "in the day when the Lord had saved him from the hand of *all his enemies*" agree with the description of victories in vers. 29–46, and point to a time when David had established his kingdom by war, and forced heathen princes to do homage (comp. vers. 44–49). But, as God's victorious help against *external* enemies is celebrated in the second part of the song, and the joyous tone of exultation shows that David's heart is taken up with the gloriousness of that help, it is a fair assumption that the song was written not after the turmoil of Absalom's conspiracy and the succeeding events (Keil), but immediately after the victorious wars narrated in chaps. viii. and x. Vers. 44, 45 may without violence be referred (Hitzig) to the fact related in viii. 9 sqq., that Toi, king of Hamath, presented his homage to David through his son Joram. So the reference to viii. 6, where the Syrians are said to have been conquered and brought gifts, is obvious. The conviction of the theocratic narrator (as expressed in the repeated remark, viii. 6, 14: "the Lord helped David, wherever he went") that David had the Lord's special help in these wars with *Syria* and *Edom*, accords with the free, joyous praise of the Lord's help in our song. The song was therefore very probably produced after the victories over the Syrians and Edomites, which were epoch-making for the establishment and extension of David's authority. David composed it doubtless at the glorious end of this war, looking at the same time at God's mercies to him in the early period of the Sauline persecution, and the *internal* wars with Saul's adherents (ii. 8–iv. 12), and making these subject-matter of praise and thanks to the Lord. The poet's imagination, in its contemplation of the two principal periods of war, moves backwards, presenting first the external wars, which were the nearest, and then the internal, with Saul and his house. The designation of time "in the day" (*i. e.*, at the time, as in Gen. ii. 4 and elsewhere) "when the Lord had saved him from the hand of Saul," points to the moment of David's victory over all his enemies, when he could breathe freely and praise God.*—*The form of the superscription* is similar to that of the superscriptions of the songs that are inserted in the history in Ex. xv. 1; Numb. xxi. 17; Deut. xxxi. 30. In Ps. xviii., as here, the song is introduced with the words: "and he said."

Vers. 2–4. The *prologue* of the song. With an unusually great number of predicates, David out of his joyously thankful heart, praises the Lord for His many deliverances. The numerous designations of God in vers. 2, 3 are the *summary statement* of what, as the song exhibits in detail, the Lord has been to him in all his trials. In ver. 4 the thankful *testimony* to the salvation that God (as above designated in vers. 2, 3) has vouchsafed him, is set forth as the *theme* of the whole song. The opening words of Ps. xviii. (ver. 2 [1]): "I love thee, O Lord, my strength," are wanting in our passage. The originality of this introduction, which the Syriac [of 2 Sam. xxii.] contains, and which "carries its own justification" (Thenius), is not to be doubted; it has here fallen out either "from illegible writing" (Thenius), or through mistake. "I deeply love† thee;" David's deep love to his God is the fruit of God's manifestations of love to him. Luther: "Thus he declareth his deepest love, that he delighteth in our Lord God; for he feeleth that his benefits are unspeakable, and from this exceeding

* שִׁירָה instead of the usual שִׁיר; "from this already it appears that the historical part of the title is from another source."—הִצִּיל introduces a relative sentence, which is in stat. const. with בְּיוֹם. Ges. § 116, 3. Comp. Ex. vi. 28; Numb. iii. 1; Ps. cxxxviii. 3.

† רחם, elsewhere only in Piel in sense of "*pity*," here in Qal (as often in Aramaic) in sense of "hearty love," for which the usual word is אָהַב.

great delight and love it cometh that He giveth him so many names, as in what followeth." These words of Ps. xviii. 2 have occasioned the noble hymns:* "With all my heart, O Lord, I love Thee" (M. Schalling), and: "Thee will I love, my strength" (J. Scheffler).—The phrase: "my strength"† denotes not the inner power of heart received by David from God (Luther), but (as is shown by the following names of God, which all refer to outward help) the manifestations of the might of God amid the trials brought on him by enemies.—**My rock and my fortress**; the same designation is found in Ps. xxxi. 4 [3] and lxxi. 3. "My rock, properly cleft‡ of a rock, which gives concealment from enemies, = he who conceals me to save me. So in Ps. xlii. 10 [9] the strong God (אֵל), is called, over against pressing enemies, "my rock."—*My fortress*,§ a place difficult of access from its height and strength, offering protection against ambush and attack, a watchtower. The *natural* basis for these figures is found in the frequent rock-clefts and steep, inaccessible hills of Palestine. Comp. Judg. vi. 2; Job xxxix. 27, 28; Isa. xxxiii. 16. The *historical* basis is furnished by David's experiences in Saul's time, when he was often obliged to betake himself to clefts and hills. Comp. 1 Sam. xxii. 5; xxiii. 14, 19; xxiv. 1, 23.—The meaning of these *concrete* figures is indicated in the added expression: **My deliverer.** Böttcher would change the pointing and read: "My *deliverance*;"‖ but there is no good ground for this, either in the occurrence of this latter word in Ps. lv. 9 [8] and cxliv. 2, or in the abstract expressions of ver. 4 [3]. Rather the indication of the Lord's *personal*, *active* help in the words *saviour* and *savest*, favors the reading "deliverer."—Ver. 3. **God of my rock,** of my house, *my rock-God.* Ps. xviii. 3 [2] has: "my strong God (אֵלִי), my rock;" these separated predicates are here united into *one* expression. The word "rock" (comp. *stone* in Gen. xlix. 24), denotes the *firmness and unshakableness of God's faithfulness, which is founded on* the unchangeableness of His being (comp. Isa. xxvi. 4 sqq.) and gives assurance of unendangered, certain security. So in Deut. xxxii. 4, 37 God is called the *rock* as the God of faithfulness, whom one securely builds on and trusts (Ps. xcii 16 [15]). Comp. ver. 47, where the name "rock-God" again occurs.—**In whom I trust** (the construction is relative). The "trust" as firm confidence answers to the rock-like firmness of the divine faithfulness, on which one may rely.—**My shield,** figure of covering against the attacks of enemies, protection against dangers. So in Gen. xv. 1 God calls Himself Abraham's shield, and in Deut. xxxiii. 29 He is the shield of the help [= the saving shield] of Israel. The figure is frequent in the Psalms; see iii. 4 [3]; vii. 11 [10, Eng. A. V.: defence]; xxviii. 7; lix. 12 [11], and elsewhere.—**And horn of my salvation,** denotes God's might and strength, which gives not only protection, but also help and salvation in the overcoming of enemies. The figure refers not to the horns of the altar (Hitzig, Moll), as if protection were the only thing involved, but to the horns of beasts, in which their strength is shown in the victorious repulse of an attack [or, in making an attack] (see 1 Sam. ii. 1, 10; Job xvi. 15; Ps. lxxv. 5, 6, 11 [4, 5, 10]; lxxxix. 18 [17]; xcii. 11 [10]; cxii. 9; cxlviii. 1). The Lord is not only protection against attacks, but also "a trusty shield and weapon" ("ein' gute wehr und waffe") for victoriously combating and repelling them. Comp. Deut. xxxiii. 29, where the God of Israel is called the shield of their help and the sword of their excellency. The reference of the "horn" to a mountain peak has small support from Isa. v. 1, and, as the comparison with the strength of horned beasts is so frequent, must be rejected.—**My stronghold** [Eng. A. V.: high tower], steep, lofty place, inaccessible and therefore safe, see Ps. ix. 10 [9 Eng. A. V.: refuge]. **And my refuge, my Saviour, who saves me from violence.** These words are wanting in Ps. xviii. Their insertion is not to be explained from the desire to give rhythmical completeness to the strophe left imperfect by the omission of the "I love Thee, Jehovah" (Keil), but from the effort (in accordance with the position of the song here in the midst of the history) to explain the preceding declarations about God in respect to the help actually given by Him. As a testimony to the *deliverance* vouchsafed David by God as his rock, etc., the words make the transition to ver. 4.—Most modern expositors regard all these appellatives as in apposition with "Jehovah," putting the latter in the vocative (so also Hitzig and Delitzsch) ["O Jehovah, my rock . . . my Saviour, Thou savest me from violence"]. But as Hupfeld (on Ps. xviii. 3 [2]) rightly remarks, this would produce too long and heavy an address. The "Jehovah" is therefore (with the older expositors and the ancient versions) to be taken as subject, and the appellations as declarations: "Jehovah *is* my rock and my fortress," etc.—Ver. 4. **As the praised one I call on the Lord,** or: **I call on the praised one, the Lord.** The participle (מְהֻלָּל) does not mean "glorious" (Hengst., Hupf.), but (conformably to the frequent *hallelujah*) = "blessed," Ps. xlviii. 2 [1]; xcvi. 4; cxiii. 3; cxlv. 3, comp. 1 Chr. xvi. 25; nor does it mean *laudandus*, "praiseworthy." [The Participles may have the force of the Lat. Fut. Passive; Eng. A. V.: "worthy to be praised," Vulg.: laudabilem; Sept.: αἰνετόν. The Chaldee (which paraphrases largely in ver. 3) takes it as active, and renders: "Said David, With praise I will pray before Jehovah." Ewald (on Ps. xviii.) renders it: "worthy to be praised."—Tr.] It is not vocative, but Accusative, and is put at the beginning of the sentence for the sake

* ["*Herzlich lieb hab ich dich o Herr,*" and "*Ich will dich lieben, meine Stärke.*"]

† חִזְקִי, a ἅπ. λεγ.

‡ סֶלַע "rock-cleft," after Arab. שלע "to cleave." [See Delitzsch on *Pss. in loco*; but this derivation is not certain.—Tr.]

§ מְצוּדָה, and so the masc. מָצוֹד, מְצַד. [See Del. on *Psalms*, and Fleischer's note.—Tr.]

‖ Böttcher: מִפְלָטִי.—The לִי (wanting in Ps. xviii. 3 [2], found in Ps. cxliv. 2), is a strengthening of the suffix ־ִי, and expresses deep feeling of the Lord's gracious help to him personally.

of emphasis, as in ver. 2; vii. 16; x. 7, 14, 17. David has actually praised the Lord in the preceding predicates; they form the content of the praise. The rendering: "Praised be Thou, I cry, O Jehovah" (G. Baur, Olshausen) does not accord with the following member: "and from my enemies I am saved." The verbs are not (with many old expositors) to be taken as future: "I will call, shall be saved," but as expressing undefined past time, comp. Ps. iii. 5 [4] [or, better as indefinite as to time, the Eng. general present.—Tr.]. David prefaces his song with this general, all-embracing declaration (based on all his experiences of the Lord's help), of which the sense is: "as often as (= when) I call on the Lord, I am saved;" and he now proceeds to exhibit its truth by the citation of his experiences. He bases his confident appeal to the Lord for help on His manifestations of might, wherein he recognizes and praises God as his deliverer.

Vers. 5–28. *First part* of the description of the divine manifestation of help, experienced by David in *the time of Saul's* persecutions.

Vers. 5–7. From the description of the *dangers* that pressed on him (vers. 5, 6), he proceeds to the *avowal* that he *called* on the Lord for help, and was *heard* (ver. 7).—Ver. 5. **For breakers of death had surrounded* me.** The "for" (lacking in Ps. xviii. 5 [4]) introduces the following as the ground of the declaration of ver. 4. Instead of "breakers" the Ps, has "cords (bands)," representing death under the image of a hunter, comp. Ps. xci. 3. The "breakers" here correspond better to the "floods" of the next member. "Floods of wickedness;" the word (בְּלִיַּעַל) means properly "uselessness, worthlessness," commonly found in an ethical sense: "wickedness," comp. xvi. 7; xx. 1; xxiii. 6; 1 Sam. ii. 12; x. 27; xxv. 17, 25. It is found also in the physical sense of "destruction, harm," Nah. i. 11; Ps. xli. 9 [8, Eng. A. V.: evil disease]. So it must be taken here also, on account of the parallels: "breakers of *death*, nets of hell, snares of death." "Had terrified† me" (suddenly come upon me). [Dr. Erdmann in his translation, renders: "floods of wickedness," but his preceding statement requires: "floods of destruction," (so Delitzsch).—Tr.]—Ver. 6. **Nets of hell** [better: Sheol.‡—Tr.]—**snares of death.** From the figure of *water-waves* the poet passes to that of the *hunter*, under which is represented the suddenly and treacherously attacking power of death. "Snares of death fall on me" (קִדְּמֻנִי) comp. ver. 19; Ps. xvii. 13; Job xxx. 27.—The words of vers. 5, 6 describe not all the dangers of David's life up to this time (Keil, Ew., Hupf., Thol.), but the snares and persecutions that befell him in Saul's time. The description of peril of life agrees only with this time, which the title also expressly mentions. This view is favored also by the relation between the two sections, vers. 5–28 and 29–46, "in the first of which David is saved by God without effort on his part, while in the second, he is both object and instrument of the divine deliverance" (Hengst.). In the same direction Riehm (in Hupfeld) well remarks that David in the whole of the first part is only *passive*, not active (only God's hand saves him), but in the second part on the contrary *himself* as a warrior, *wards off* his enemies.—Ver. 7. Looking back at those deadly dangers, David affirms that he was driven by them *to call on God*, and was *heard* by him. **In my distress* I called upon the Lord, and to my God I called.** Instead of "called" the Ps. has "cried," answering to the distress that forced such a cry from him. **And he heard my voice out of his palace,** out of God's heavenly dwelling, as contrasted with the depth of distress on earth, out of which he sent up to God his cry for help. Comp. Ps. xvi. 4: "The Lord is in his holy palace, the Lord's throne is in heaven." *Thence* appears the Lord's help. [Eng. A. V., not so well: "temple," for, though heaven may be regarded as a temple, Jehovah is here represented as a king, enthroned in heaven and the word "temple" would most probably be understood by English readers of the earthly building consecrated to His service. The Hebrew word means both *palace* and *temple*.—Tr.] **And my cry into his ears.** The Ps., has the fuller vivid description: "and my cry came before him, into his ears;" our passage has the advantage of more emphatic brevity (comp. Hengst., Rem.).

Vers. 8–20. *Splendid poetical description of God's help appearing in answer to his prayer*, under the *image* of a terrible *storm* accompanied by an *earthquake*, the individual features being given with vivid coloring in accordance with the natural order of the phenomena. Comp. Tholuck, on Psalms, p. 91.—As the preceding description of distress refers not to the whole of David's life, but only to the Sauline period, so this poetical description is not to be understood of a real storm (as in 1 Sam. vii. 10) that terrified the enemy and saved David. Thenius, Ewald and Hitzig, indeed, so understand it, and refer it to a storm in a battle with the Syrians (2 Sam. vii. 5), and similarly others. But, in the first place, the connection is against this; for the deliverance described in vers. 17–20 is clearly none other than the salvation from the distress pictured in vers. 5–7. Further, the figure (here poetically elaborated) of a terrible storm, is the standing form of representation of *God's glory and majesty* in the revelation of His holiness and punitive justice, as in the fundamental passage, Ex. xix. (the legislation on Sinai). So are often represented *God's theophanies* for the revelation of His anger, for the accomplishment of His judgments, for the

---

* אָפַף, not: "press, drive" (after the Arab.), but, after indubitable tradition (comp. אוֹפָן "a wheel"), "encircle, surround," as poetic synonym of כִּתֵּר, הִקִּיף, סָבַב (Del. on Ps. xviii.).

† יְבַעֲתֻנִי, Impf. interchanging with Waw. consec. and Impf., because it describes condition (Hupf.).

‡ [Sheol, the underworld, place of departed spirits.—Tr.]

* צַר, comp. Job xv. 24. Literally: "in the distress to me," that is, in this my distress; for the construction comp. Ps. lxvi. 14; cvi. 44; cvii. 6 and elsewhere. This mode of expression is based on the common formula צַר־לִי "it is strait to me," "I am in distress," the preposition being preposed here to a whole sentence, as commonly to a noun (Hupf.).

deliverance of His people from their enemies and for new unfoldings of the glory of His kingdom; comp. besides Ex. xix. 16–18, especially Judg. v. 4, 5; Isa. xxix. 6; xxx. 27–30; Joel ii. 10, 11; iii. 3 sq. [ii. 30, 31]; Nah. i. 3–6; Ps. l. 2, 3; lxxvii. 17–19 [16–18]; xcvii. 2–5.—Certainly, "if the poet had meant by all this to say merely: 'God even in the greatest need, has accorded me almighty help,' the apparatus would in fact be too great" (Thenius). But the connection shows that he means to say more; looking at the fears and dangers of the gloomy time of Saul's persecution, he will comprehensively set forth how the Lord visited His wrathful judgments on the enemy that so oppressed him, God's servant, and in him endangered the cause of God's kingdom, and how the Lord by His invincible might, saved him and gave victory to his cause. "The combination of the figure of ver. 17 sqq., with other and general features, suggests that it also has a general reference." (Hupfeld). So Riehm (in Hupf., p. 465) remarks that the description has no historical reference, but by its poetical form, holds itself above the plane of concrete history.

Ver. 8. The *earthquake* is the sign of God's approaching *wrath;* as the Lord descends from His temple in heaven to judgment on earth, the whole earth quakes before Him. There is probably in this an allusion to *thunder* as the voice of the approaching wrathful God, under the mighty peals of which heaven and earth shake; see Joel ii. 10, 11; iv. 16; [iii. 16]. Nah. i. 5. The effect is vividly represented in the text by paronomasia* in three verbs ("the earth was shaking and quaking, the foundations of heaven quailing and shaking").—**The foundations of the heaven** shake together with the earth. The Psalm, in which only the shaking of the earth is spoken of, has: "the foundations of the *mountains*." The mountains rising up towards heaven are, according to the natural view, regarded as the foundation on which heaven rests; comp. Job xxvi. 11, where they are called "the pillars of heaven." "The text of 2 Sam., represents the whole *universe* as trembling before Him, in order to picture strongly the terribleness of the wrath of the Almighty; so Joel. ii. 10, 11; iv. 16 [iii. 16]; Isa. xiii. 13." **For he was wroth.** The wrath of God is here expressly stated to be the cause of the trembling of heaven and earth.—Ver. 9. Elaboration of the preceding "he was wroth," by the description of the approaching *appearance* of the wrath of God, under the figure of smoke and fire. **Smoke rose in his nostril**—not: "in His *anger*" (Sept., Vulg., Stier), but (in keeping with the parallel "mouth") His *nose*, which is considered the seat of anger (so also in Greek and Latin writers); and so its *snorting* (comp. ver. 16), as in the case of an angry man, is the figure of God's anger, which, as a heightening of the image, is compared to smoke, as in Ps. lxxiv. 1; lxxx. 5 [4, Eng. A. V.; "be angry," literally: "smoke"]; Deut. xxix. 19. **And fire devoured out of his mouth.** Fire is a standing image of God's consuming anger (comp. Deut. xxxii. 22). The smoke, as the natural accompaniment of fire, denotes the uprising and approach of God's anger. For similar figure of smoke and fire see (besides the fundamental passage, Ex. xix. 18), Isa. lxv. 5. The "out of his *mouth*" is parallel to "out of his *nose*." The image of the mouth answers to the consuming force of the fire of wrath. The verb "devoured" is to be taken without an object (as "the enemy"); it stands absolutely (as in Ps. l. 3), only the consuming power of the fire being indicated. **Glowing coals burned out of him**; the "glowing coals" is parallel to the "devouring fire," adding to the picture the feature of the flames that proceed from the fire. "Out of him," that is, out of His mouth, as a burning oven, pour the flames of the sea of fire (comp. Gen. xv. 17). The mouth is designated as the medium of the revelation of anger; because the fire of human anger pours from the heart through the mouth in angry *words*. The fire in the Lord's mouth is symbolized "as one flaming in full glow" (Hupfeld). There is no reference here to flashes of lightning. "These are the later product (comp. ver. 13) of the flame of fire and anger, that is here just kindled" (Hengst.). But since the representation of a rising storm (breaking out afterwards in ver. 13 with thunder and lightning) is carried out in the poetical conception, so in the picture thus far the image of smoke and flaming fire is to be referred to the rising of the storm-cloud and the flaming of the sheet-lightning that announces the storm (Tholuck).

Vers. 10–12. Now follows the poetical description of the appearance of the Lord from heaven under the figures of the thickening and gathering clouds, on which the Lord sweeps on as on a throne, and of the storm-wind, on whose wings He rushes.—Ver. 10. **And he bowed the heavens**—a picture of the low-hanging storm-clouds, at whose approach the heaven seems to bend down to the earth. Comp. Ps. cxliv. 5; Isa. lxiii. 19.—**And came down**, the *descent of the Lord from heaven to earth to execute judgment* on David's enemies, and deliver him. On the indication of God's coming to judgment by His "descent from heaven," comp. Gen. xi. 7; xviii. 21; Isa. lxiv. 1.—**And cloud-darkness under His feet**, *i. e.*, He thus descended. The *dark, black cloud** (= darkness, ver. 12) is the symbol of the *terror* that the *wrath* of God carries with it; see Ex. xix. 16 [Sinai]; xx. 21; Deut. v. 19; Ps. civ. 29 (a figure of the hiding of God's face); Nah. i. 3 ("clouds are the dust of his feet").—Ver. 11. **And he rode on the cherub and flew.**—As to the signification of the cherub, see on 1 Sam. iv. 4. As the cherubim on the cover of the ark (Ex. xxv. 18 sqq.; xxxvii. 7 sqq.) are the bearers of the divine

* גָּעַשׁ, רָעַשׁ, רָגַז.—The Qeri וַיִּתְגָּעַשׁ is doubtless an imitation of the following וַיִּתְגָּעֲשׁוּ (especially as גָּעַשׁ does not elsewhere occur in Qal), and is to be rejected, since then ארץ immediately afterwards would be Masc. and Fem. The ותגעש (Kethib) is, as in the Psalm-text, to be pointed וַתִּגְעַשׁ (forming complete paronomasia with the וַתִּרְעַשׁ), unless it be preferred to read (with several codices) וַתִּתְגָּעַשׁ according with the וַיִּתְגָּעֲשׁוּ, — properly "to move hither and thither" (Hitzig).

* עֲרָפֶל, often connected with עָנָן.

majesty and glory (vi. 2; 2 Kings xix. 15; Ps. lxxx. 2 [1]; xcix. 1; Isa. xxxvii. 16), so here also the cherub is the symbol of God's almighty power and glory, as it appears in the creaturely world, and exhibits itself as the revelation of the highest and completest being (Winer, *R.-W.*, *s. v.*, Hengst. on Ps. xviii. 11 [10]). The "rode" is defined by the "flew." The conception of *flying* is harmonized with that of *riding* on the cherub (as a chariot or throne) by the *wings* with which the cherub is provided.—**And appeared on the wings of the wind**; this, as the preceding, sets forth the majesty in which God appears in the creation in the elementary substratum of the *wind*, to hold judgment. Comp. Isa. v. 28; Nah. i. 3: "in tempest and storm is his way," and Ps. civ. 3, where, instead of the cherub, the *clouds* are conceived of as the vehicle, and the *wings of the wind* as the bearers of the appearance of His glory.—Instead of "appeared" Ps. xviii. 11 [10] has "flew" (וַיֵּדֶא). The latter (which occurs also Deut. xxviii. 49; Jer. xlviii. 40; xlix. 22) carries out the figure of the *wings* of the wind; here, on the contrary, our "appeared" is, if not an *elucidation* (Keil, v. Leng.), a *real statement* instead of a poetical figure. But there is no necessity for regarding it as a scribal error (Stier, Thenius), or as a "vague, flat and inappropriate reading" (Hupfeld).—Ver. 12. Development of the second half of ver. 10, as ver. 11 is of the first half. **And he made darkness around him booths** [Eng. A. V.: pavilions]. The clouds mass more closely; their darkness grows blacker. The "darkness" is that of the clouds of ver. 10 *b*. He makes the cloud-darkness "booths, tents" for Himself. The Psalm has more fully: "he made darkness *his secret place*, his *pavilion* round about him darkness of waters, thick clouds of the skies." On the "round about" comp. Ps. xcvii. 2 ("clouds and darkness are around him"), and on the "booths [pavilions]" Job xxxvi. 29, where the clouds are called God's tabernacle or tent.—**Gathering of waters, cloud-thicket** is further explanation of the "darkness" of the first clause. Instead of "gathering* of waters" the Ps. has "darkness of waters" [which is here unnecessarily adopted by Eng. A. V.—Tr.]; the former is obviously more picturesque.—Vers. 13–15. Issuing of *lightning-flashes* out of this darkness, and bursting of the storm amid thunder and lightning. **Out of the brightness before him burned coals of fire.** The expression "brightness before him" points back to the fire in ver. 9, the flames of sheet-lightning as symbol of the divine anger. Out of this fiery brightness before him "burned coals of fire," *i. e.*, darted the *flashes of lightning*, which are, as it were, the sharpening of that flaming fire-anger into separate fiery arrows (comp. ver. 15). The "brightness before him" is not the *doxa* [glory] of God embracing light and fire (Hupf., Del.), because in the connection only the *fire of God's anger* is spoken of, and if the singer had here had in view the light in which God dwells (Ps. civ. 2), he would necessarily have used the general term "glory" (כָּבוֹד, הוֹד, δόξα). The natural basis of the poetical description is the blinding brightness of the flaming fire, which in a storm seems to cleave the clouds and send forth flashes of lightning.—To this refers the deviating text of the Psalm: "from the brightness before him his clouds passed away (or went to pieces)," comp. Job xxx. 15.—Ver. 14. **The Lord thundered from heaven.** Since lightning and thunder appear so close together, the storm is very near, God's wrathful judgment bursts on the enemy. Instead of "from heaven" the Ps. has "in heaven." God is here called **the Most High** as "the all-controlling, unapproachable judge" (Del.). The "giving [uttering] his voice" is poetical designation of thunder; see Job xxxvii. 3; Ps. xxix. 3 sqq., comp. Ex. ix. 23; Ps. xlvi. 7 [6]; lxviii. 34 [33]; lxxvii. 18. The phrase "hailstones and coals of fire" found in the Ps. in this verse and the preceding, is wanting here.—Ver. 15. **And he sent out arrows**; the Ps. has: "his arrows." These are the flashes of lightning (comp. lxxvii. 18) into which the foe-destroying fire of wrath concentrates and sharpens itself. The wrathful, punishing God is represented under the figure of a warrior armed with bow and arrows, as in many other passages, Ps. vii. 13, 14 [12, 13]; xxxviii. 3 [2]; Job vi. 4; Deut. xxxii. 23; Lam. iii. 12, 13.—**And scattered them**, that is, the enemies, comp. vers. 4, 18. The pronoun "them" does not refer to the arrows and lightning. The first effect is the *scattering* of the compact masses, into which the enemies had thrown themselves. **Lightning, and discomfited (them).** The Ps. has: "and lightnings much (innumerable)" [Eng. A. V. (with Kimchi) "shot out lightnings"]. The verb here is to be supplied from the preceding, as in vers. 12, 14, 42. "He discomfited" (so Jerome); the Ps. has: "and discomfited *them*," from which the Qeri [margin] omits* the suffix "them." The further effect of the Lord's interference is the complete destruction of the enemy; comp. Ex. xiv. 24; xxiii. 27; Josh. x. 10; Judg. iv. 15; 1 Sam. vii. 10.—Ver. 16. **And the beds† of the sea became visible.** The Ps. has the weaker expression: "brooks of water." **Uncovered were the foundations of the earth,‡** that is, the bottom of the sea, the waters being blown away; a parallel description to the preceding. In addition to the *thunder* and *lightning* from above comes the *storm-wind* (which accompanies the storm) and the *earthquake*, which has already been pictured (ver. 8) as an effect of God's anger. **By the rebuking of the Lord**, that is, the expression of anger in the *voice* of the thunder (ver.

* The ἅπ. λεγ. חַשְׁרָה signifies (according to the Arabic) "gathering, aggregation"—עָב properly "thicket" (comp. Ex. xix. 9).—שְׁחָקִים — the clouds as a connected whole (Hengst.).

* [Dr. Erdmann's text has: "the Qeri has taken the suffix," and accordingly he writes it in parenthesis. This, however, is an oversight; the Kethib has the suffix, the Qeri omits it.—Tr.]

† אָפִיק — stream-bed from אָפַק "to contain," hence of hollow bodies, — holder, pipe, canal, channel, dale, — αὐλός, αὐλών, then brook, properly (like נחל) the valley in which it flows (Hupf.).

‡ תֵּבֵל, poetic designation of the earth, Ps. lxxxix. 12 [11]; xc. 2; xciii. 1; xcvi. 10—יִגָּלוּ by poetic license without ו, which is to be supplied from the preceding verb.

14); comp. Ps. civ. 7, where the waters of the chaos are affrighted at the rebuke of God (parallel to His thunder-voice). **At the snorting of the breath of his nose**, comp. ver. 9. The Psalm has the second person, turning in sudden address to Jehovah: "at *thy* rebuke and *thy* anger." The "breakers of death" and the "streams of evil" have, according to ver. 5 overwhelmed David. Under the image of water-waves he has there depicted the dangers that threatened his life. This alone would prevent our supposing that we have here a mere poetic-hyperbolical delineation of the tumult of the waters as result of the storm, in order to fill out the picture (Hupf.). But the following account (ver. 17) of deliverance "out of great waters" is still more opposed to this view. In his distress David was overwhelmed as by mighty water-floods. The Lord, revealing His anger against his enemies, saves him by laying bare the depths of the sea in which he had sunk, and uncovering the foundations of the earth by the storm-wind of His wrath (so Delitzsch). Thither descending from on high the Lord seized him and drew him forth from the waves, as is described in the following verses. There is therefore as little ground for the view of Hitzig, that the waves denote the host of the enemy, and the bottom the ground on which they stood and from which they were driven, as for that of Thenius, that the assumed battle was near a large inland sea (he conjectures the Bahr el Atebe near Damascus, about as large as the sea of Gennesaret), and that the description is thus to be taken "almost literally." The interpretation of the "foundations of the earth" as Sheol (Hengst., Keil) is without support in the text.

Vers. 17–20. After the description of the descent of God from heaven to save, David now *traces* the *deliverance* itself, and praises the Lord for it.—Ver. 17. "He sent forth," the word "hand" (Ps. cxliv. 7) is to be supplied, as in vi. 6; Ps. lvii. 4 [3] = He reached out from on high, that is, from heaven. In spite of the "came down" of ver. 10, which refers to God's throne in heaven, the poetical view holds fast to the conception of God's elevation above men. "He drew me out of many waters." The verb (מָשָׁה) occurs elsewhere only in Ex. ii. 10 of Moses, whose name is formed * from it, and whose deliverance from the waters of the Nile is here probably alluded to. Luther: "he made a Moses of me." The "many waters" [better in Erdmann's translation: "great waters"—Tr.] are not enemies, but the deadly perils that had befallen him, comp. ver. 5; Ps. xxxii. 6; lxvi. 12; lxix. 2, 3 [1, 2]; Isa. xliii. 2, where water is a figure of great distress and danger.—Ver. 18. Here David first passes from his perils to his *enemies*. **He delivered me from my enemy, the strong† one.** "The song here passes from the epic to a more lyric tone, and direct discourse takes the place of figurative" (Del.). The Sing. "my enemy" does not justify the supposition of an individual enemy, but from the following "my haters" is to be taken as collective, though the name Saul rightly stands as superscription to this whole picture of distress. **Because they were stronger * than I**, had overpowered me. God's saving interposition was necessary, since David in his weakness felt himself overpowered by his enemies—extreme impotence requires divine help.—Ver. 19. Elucidation of the last words of ver. 18. **They fell on † me in the day of my calamity.** This is not a definite day, but the time of his helplessness in the Sauline persecution; their purpose was to finish him by a sudden attack, and so self-help was impossible. **And the Lord became a stay to me.** After deliverance comes support. ‡ Compare for the thought Psalm xxiii. 4.—Verse 20. **And he brought me forth into a large place**, into a condition of freedom,§ in contrast with narrowness, straits. The "me"‖ is emphatic. The words: **He delivered me**, here in conclusion embrace all that has been heretofore said of the process of deliverance. Observe the *progression* in the description up to this point: the dispersion and confounding of the *enemy* by the arrows of the *lightning*, the driving off of the *water-waves* and laying bare of their *foundations* by the storm; then the stretching forth of the hand, seizing, drawing out of the great waters, supporting the helpless man, bringing him out of straits into freeness, and thus completing the deliverance.—**For He delighted in me**—the *ground* of the Lord's deliverance, over against the *enemies*, on whom had come God's wrath and judgment. This *delight* of the Lord in Him (Ps. xxii. 9 [8]; xli. 12 [11]) is based on his *integrity*, as is brought out in what follows. There follows, namely,

Vers. 21–28, *the exhibition of the ground of his deliverance;* it is his *righteousness*, according to which the Lord requited him.—Ver. 21. The *declaration* and *avowal* that God in saving him *requited* him according to his *righteousness*. The verb¶ [Eng. A. V.: "reward"] (comp. Ps. vii. 17 [16]) signifies to do something to a person, whether bad or good, but with reference to his conduct as ground, hence to *requite*.—**According to the cleanness of my hands he recompensed me.**—The hands are the instrument of action, and "cleanness of hands" signifies the purity of his *actions* from sin and unrighteousness. Comp. ver. 25; Ps. vii. 5 [4]; xxiv. 4; xxvi. 6; Job ix. 30; xxii. 30. To this answers purity of *mind* (expressed in the "upright"

* [On the origin and meaning of the name *Moses* see Canon Cook's Essay on Egyptian Words in the Pentateuch, in *Bib.-Com.*, I. 482.—Tr.]

† עָז, not adverbial Acc., but Adjective; comp. Psalm cxliii. 10 [טוֹבָה].

* This form of comparison also in Psalm cxxxi. 1; xxxviii. 5 [4].

† קִדֵּם, see ver. 6; Ps. xvii. 13.

‡ The Psalm has the usual less poetic לְמִשְׁעָן [which reading is found here also in some MSS. and EDD.—Tr.]

§ מֶרְחָב (Ps. cxviii. 5), in contrast with צַר; so the verb (Hiph.), Gen. xxvi. 22; Ps. iv. 2 [1]; xxv. 17; Prov. xviii. 16.

‖ אֹתִי in contrast with the suffix in the Psalm, and answering to the לִי in ver. 19.

¶ גָּמַל, in connection with שִׁלֵּם or הֵשִׁיב [so here], or with כְּצִדְקָתִי added; the Psalm has כְּצִדְקִי.—The Imperfects here express in general propositions general time, the so-called Present (Hupf.).

of ver. 24), as source of purity of conduct. David often thus affirms his uprightness, for ex., xvii. 3–5. The truth of this testimony to himself is exhibited in his actual conduct as described in vers. 22–24, where he gives the *ground* (כִּי) for the declaration that he is "righteous" and "his hands clean."—[On the ethical and religious significance of this claim to righteousness, see "Historical and Theological" to this chapter, paragraph 6.—Tr.]—Ver. 22. He proved his righteousness by the affirmation: **I have kept the ways of the Lord.** "Have observed, held to," so Job xxii. 15. "The ways of the Lord" are the rules of human conduct given in His law, which David's enemies had wickedly transgressed. **—And have not wickedly departed from my God,** as he has kept God's ways, so he has not *sinned* himself *away from God Himself.* The phrase is literally: "to be wicked from God," that is, to fall away from God by wickedness. Not (as Grotius): "to be wicked *against* (מִן) God," nor is it a designation of judgment or decision proceeding from God, as if the sense were: "I have not sinned according to God's decision, according to His judgment I am guiltless" (Hupf.); comp. Job iv. 17; Jer. li. 5. Against this is both the "keeping the Lord's ways" in the first member, to which corresponds "not departing *from*" the Lord, and the following reference [ver. 23] to his abiding in God's statutes and judgments.—Ver. 23. "For* all thy judgments are before me," that is, as a guide in my ways.**—And His statutes, I do not depart from them.**† The reading of the Psalm: "His statutes I do not put away from me," is not elsewhere found, while our text is the usual expression for the conception. For the thought compare the divine testimony to David, 1 Kings xiv. 8: "who kept my commandments, and walked after me with all his heart," and xv. 5; "David did what was right in the eyes of the Lord, and departed not from all that He commanded him." Comp. also David's testimony concerning himself, 1 Sam. xxvi. 23 sq.—Ver. 24. "And I was upright‡ towards him," that is, *upright in soul,* the "towards him" (לוֹ) expressing the immediate relation to God, in contrast with outward works, which are done for one's own sake or for men's. The "with him" of the Psalm expresses still more exactly cordial communion of life with God.**—And guarded myself from my iniquity,** the negative side of his moral character, of which he has just given the positive side: "I guarded against committing a sin, and so contracting guilt." A similar hypothetical expression [*i. e.*, *if* I sinned, I should be guilty] is found in Ps. xvii. 3 (Hupfeld), and so essentially Job xxxiii. 9: "there is no iniquity in me." David declares that he constantly watches over and restrains himself; otherwise, the assumption is, he would have fallen into sin; this is an indirect testimony to indwelling sinfulness, whereby he might have been led to sinful deed, and against which such self-guarding was necessary. Comp. Psalm li. 7 [5], where David *expressly declares* his consciousness of sinfulness inborn in him, which is not the case here.—The historical proofs of David's declaration of purity are given in 1 Sam. xxiv. xxvi. though he at this moment may not have had all the individual facts in mind.—Vers. 22–24 exhibit the climax: ver. 22 *proof* of uprightness in *outward walk,* ver. 23 *practice* of righteousness in obedience to *God's commands* as its norm, ver. 24, *source* of righteousness in a pious *disposition* directed towards God.—Ver. 25. Repetition of the affirmation of ver. 21 (the proof of his "righteousness" and "cleanness of hands" having been given in vers. 22–24) in the form of a *logical conclusion:* **And so the Lord requited me,** *etc.* Literally: "and requited me the Lord," where the "and," connecting this with the preceding, indicates a logical relation [the logical relation is indicated by the progress of the discourse, not by the Conjunction, in Hebrew or in Eng.—Tr.]. Instead of "my cleanness" the Psalm has "the cleanness of my hands," as in ver. 21.

Vers. 26, 27. *General proposition,* explaining and supporting the word: "the Lord requited me" by *the truth,* that *God deports Himself to man as man to Him.* This moral relation between God and man is carried out in four parallel members, "in which the divine conduct is expressed by reflexive verbs, formed from the adjectives expressing human conduct." (Keil). The Imperfects express what is universal and necessary. The general truth that the manifestation of God's retributive righteousness is conditioned by man's position and conduct towards God, is set forth *positively* in vers. 26, 27 a in relation to the pious, and *negatively* in ver. 27 b in relation to the ungodly. Towards the pious [better: *merciful*—Tr.], upright and clean, God shows Himself pious [merciful], upright and pure. The adjectives express qualities* of man in relation to God; the "love" here expressed is not towards man, but towards God, (חָסִיד, Eng. A. V. *merciful*), and to such God shows Himself loving. [Rather the adjectives express general qualities without any

* כִּי — but. "The establishment of one opposite gives the ground for the denial of the other" (Hengst.).

† מִמֶּנָּה Sing. instead of Plu., as 2 Kings ii. 3; xiii. 2. 6; x. 29, 31 after חַטֹּאות (Hitzig, Hupfeld).—לֹא־אָסוּר, comp. Deut. v. 29; xvii. 11; xxviii. 14. The Psalm has לֹא אָסִיר מֶנִּי.

‡ [תָּמִים is more exactly: "perfect." Comp. Job i. 1: "perfect and upright." See ver. 26.—Tr.]

* חָסִיד "loving" towards God, so תָּמִים "upright" towards God (comp. לוֹ in ver. 25), and נָבָר (Niph. Particip. of בָּרַר) *purified,* then "pure," — בַּר, comp. the "pure heart, Ps. xxiv. 4; lxiii. 1, the pure mind."—הִתְחַסָּד, Hithp. denom. from חֶסֶד or חָסִיד, found only here.—גִּבּוֹר תָּמִים "hero of innocence, upright hero." גִּבּוֹר always — "hero." תָּמִים often as here (comp. Hupf. on Ps. xv. 4) abstract subst. — תֹּם "uprightness." The Ps. has גְּבַר, infrequent poetical form for גֶּבֶר. תָּמַם in Hithp. is found elsewhere only Dan. xii. 10 [it is found only in Ps. xviii. 26.—Tr.]—תִּתָּבָר is for תִּתְבָּרַר, which form is found in the Psalm, "with broadened vowel before the tone-syllable, and besides, euphonic doubling of the ת as compensation for the contraction and for the maintenance of the rhythm" (Hupf.).

statement that they refer only to God. The first of these adjectives means either "favored, beloved" or "merciful," and the latter sense is more appropriate here.—Tr.].—**Towards the perverse thou showest thyself perverse**, that is, requiting to the perverse man perverse things as the consequence of his sin, thou seemest to Him to be thyself perverse. The ungodly man, failing to recognize his own sin, thinks of God as unjust and cruel towards him. Comp. Lev. xxvi. 23, 24; "if ye walk perversely towards me; I will walk perversely towards you." Moral perversity in man produces perversity and confusion in his knowledge of God. [The thought here, however, is simply that God does evil to the man that does evil.—Tr.].—Ver. 28 gives the ground and confirmation of the general truth in vers. 26, 27, by pointing to God's actual conduct towards the two principal classes in the people, the humble and the proud, who represent concretely the preceding contrast between the upright (merciful, pure) and the perverse. The factual relation of this verse to the preceding is indicated in the Psalm by the initial "for thou," while here the simple "and" is used, in order to avoid a too frequent recurrence of the causal conjunction, as ver. 29 begins with "for thou," and ver. 30 with "for." The word "people"* is here limited (by the contrast with the "haughty" of the following clause) to a large community within the nation, characterized by the epithet "afflicted;" and the following contrast shows that they are also "humble." "*Thine* eyes are against the haughty," who oppress the poor and afflicted; "whom thou bringest down" (the verb is to be taken as relative, Ew. § 332 b, comp. Josh. ii. 11; iii. 12; v. 15). The Psalm has in the second member: "lofty eyes (elevated eye-brows, sign of haughtiness) thou bringest down." Comp. Prov. vi. 17; xxi. 4; xxx. 13; Ps. ci. 5.

Vers. 29–46. *Second part* of the description of the *help* that David received from the Lord, namely, in wars against external enemies.—*Looking back* at these wars, he tells how through the Lord's help he had overcome his enemies. But he looks also to the present and to the future, declaring what the Lord, after such aid, still is to him and ever will be. So in this section occur verbs of past, present and future times.—Ver. 29. First, he *declares* what *the Lord* (in connection with the exhibitions of grace in the Sauline persecution) is for him perpetually. The "for" attaches this verse as the ground or confirmation of the preceding, where David included himself among the "afflicted people," the oppressed; the Lord has helped him "the afflicted one" out of the affliction brought on him by his enemies. All these experiences of divine help find their reason or ground in the fact that *the Lord* is *his lamp*.† While "light" is always the symbol of good fortune and well-being (Job xviii. 5), the burning lamp denotes the source of lasting happiness and joyful strength; Job xviii. 6; xxi. 17; xxix. 3; Ps. cxxxii. 17; comp. Isa. xlii. 3; xliii. 17. The Psalm has the unusual expression: "thou *makest light* my lamp."—What the lamp is for a man in his house, the source of joy and good fortune, this the Lord is for David: *his lamp*, the source of his well-being. This is the ground of David's being called (xxi. 17) *the lamp of Israel*. This is the ground of the declaration: "the Lord is my *light*." (Ps. xxvii. 1). The *consequence* of this is: **The Lord enlightens my darkness**. Darkness is the symbol of affliction—in contrast with light, without God, his lamp, he would have remained in wretchedness and ruin. His experiences are based on the general truth: it is the Lord who, as His lamp, makes even the darkness light about Him. Comp. Job xxix. 3. In the Psalm: "The Lord, *my God*, makes my darkness light." This general declaration, proved by the past, is confirmed also for the future by setting forth the foe-conquering might which he, through the Lord's help, has shown and will forever be able to show.—Ver. 30. **For with thee I run against troops, with my God I leap over walls**—literally: "in thee;" "David declares that he is 'in God,' and therefore has such power." (Hengst.). By "troops" David means the *hostile bands* that he has attacked on the battle-field, and by "walls" the fortified places that he has conquered. Such power of victory he has now also in his God. Since the verb "run" here properly takes an Accus., it is unnecessary to take the word in the sense "crush" (Ew., Olsh.).* "Running" is represented as an essential quality of the warrior in ver. 34; 1, 19, 23; ii. 18, and means (with the prep. "against" or "to") hostile attack Job xv. 26; vi. 14; Dan. viii. 6. [Eng. A. V., not so well: "run through.—Tr.]—Ver. 31. The word "God" is in apposition with the: "with my God" in ver. 30 (as in vers. 33, 48), not nominative Absolute [so Eng. A. V.], since then the Art. [Heb.: *the God*] would be unexplained: **The God whose way is blameless**, that is, whose government is perfect. This human quality of perfectness is transferred to God, and denotes His trustworthiness. **The word of the Lord is purified**, that is, without guile, pure, true, comp. Ps. xii. 7 [6]. God's promises do not deceive. **He is a shield to all that trust in Him.** He offers sure protection against all dangers. The second and third members of this verse occur word for word also in Prov. xxx. 5. All these affirmations respecting God give the ground for the declaration in ver. 30, that he can do so great things in and with his God.—Ver. 32. The soleness of the Lord as such a God, is next stated as the ground ("for") of the fact that His way is perfect, His word pure and His protection sure. The expression "rock" (comp. ver. 3) especially emphasizes the quality of trustworthiness, firmness as the foundation for immovable trust, and the ground of his help and protection. Parallel is vii. 22; "for there is no one as thou, and there is no God beside thee." Comp. Deut. xxxii.

* עַם עָנִי "oppressed, afflicted *people*," — אָדָם, אֲנָשִׁים, Ps. iii. 7 [6]; Gen. xx. 4.

† נֵר "lamp," as that which burns.

* אָרוּץ with Acc. (as the following אֲדַלֶּג), object reached by the motion. Ew. and Olsh. unnecessarily take it from רָצַץ.—The Ps. has בְךָ instead of בְּכָה, and אָרֻץ instead of אָרוּץ.

31; 1 Sam. ii. 2.—Ver. 33 carries on the thought connected with the figure of the "rock." The "God" here is in opposition with the "God" at the end of the preceding verse. **The God who is my strong fortress.** [Eng. A. V., not so well: "my strength and power."]. On the "fortress" comp. Ps. xxxi. 5 [4]; xxvii. 1. [Eng. A. V.: "strength."]. The noun "strength" defines "my fortress," literally: "my fortress of strength," as in Ps. lxxi. 7 *.—The Psalm has: "who girds me with strength," = ver. 40 a (with omission of "to battle.").—**And leads† the perfect man on his way.** The pronoun on "his way" refers not to God, but to the "perfect man," as is required by the "his feet" [Eng. A. V.: "my feet"] of the next verse. The Psalm has: "who makes my way perfect." [This is the marginal reading (Qeri) here also: "my way," and seems to agree better with the context, in which the Psalmist is speaking of his own experiences.—Tr.]—Ver. 34. **He makes his feet like the hinds,** that is, like hinds' feet; Hab. iii. 18. (On this abridged form of expression see Ges. § 144, Rem.) Hengstenberg.: "In Egyptian paintings also the hind is the symbol of fleetness." Comp. ii. 18; 1 Chr. xii. 8. The Psalm: "*my* feet" [so Eng. A. V. here, after the margin]; the third personal pronoun is used here because the reference is to the "perfect (or innocent)" man [in ver. 33 according to the author's translation]. The *swiftness* refers not to fleeing (De Wette), but to the pursuit of enemies. **And on my high-places He sets me.** The "high-places" are not those of the *enemy*, which he ascends as victor, and through faith declares beforehand to be his own (Hengst.), but "those of his own land, which he victoriously holds against his enemies" (Keil). Comp. Deut. xxxii. 13.—Ver. 35. **He instructs my hands for war,‡ and my arms bend the bronze bow.** Or, perhaps (with Hupf.): "He instructs my hands for war, and my arms to bend§ the bronze bow." "The Egyptian weapons were almost all of bronze" (Hengst.). To bend the bronze‖ bow is the sign of great strength; the thought expressed is: God has given him not only skill, but also strength for victorious war.—Ver. 36. From the figure of the *bow* David passes to that of the *shield.* As in *attack*, so in *defence* the Lord is his strength. **And thou gavest me the shield of thy salvation,** the shield that consists in God's salvation, whereby He protects His people. Comp. Eph. vi. 17: "helmet of salvation." The following words in the Psalm: "and thy right hand supported me" are wanting here; they seem to have been omitted, not through error, but for brevity's sake, as in general our song, compared with the Psalm, shows a preference for curt, pregnant expression. **And thy hearing made me great.** *Hearing* = favorable acceptance of a request. This "hearing"* (not "thy lowliness," Hengst., or "thy toil," Böttch.) answers to the "salvation" of the preceding clause; he received salvation through God's granting his petition. The Psalm has: "thy humility, condescension" (comp. Ps. cxiii. 6; Isa. lvii. 15; lxvi. 1 sq.) [Eng. A. V., following the pointing of the Psalm, renders: "thy gentleness" ("meekness" would be a more accurate translation). Our text reads literally: "thy answering," or "thy toiling, suffering," neither of which gives a satisfactory sense in the connection. The reading of the Psalm is better.—Tr.]—Ver. 37. **Thou enlargedst my steps under† me,** gave me free room, so that I could advance without hindrance. Prov. iv. 12 presents the contrasted condition of straitness and stumbling: "when thou goest, thy steps shall not be straitened, and when thou runnest, thou shalt not stumble," comp. ver. 34. Hupfeld remarks rightly that we have not here merely the usual contrast of *narrowness* and *wideness* = distress and deliverance (Ps. iv. 2 [1], comp. Ps. xxxi. 9 [8]); the wide path (step) is prepared by the Lord for the successful termination of the battle, especially for the unhindered *pursuit* of the enemy (ver. 38). **And my ankles wavered not** (elsewhere: "my *feet*, or steps, Ps. xxvi. 1; xxxvii. 31), that is, thou gavest me the *power* so to go with free step. Wavering, as opposed to standing firm, comes from weakness in the knees or ankles.

Vers. 38–43. After this preparation and equipment for battle by the Lord's strength, David *destroyed the power of his enemies.*—Vers. 38, 39. The act of *pursuit* and *destruction* is declared to be *his own act.* The verbs are to be taken in the Imperfect signification, since it is clear from ver. 40 sqq.‡ that the reference is to the past. **I pursued my enemies and destroyed them;** the Psalm has the weaker expression: "overtook them" (Ps. vii. 6 [5] comp. Ex. xv. 9). In the Psalm there is an advance in the thought, here a simple synonymous parallelism (Hengst.). Ver. 39 expresses the idea of total destruction by an aggregation of words: "and I destroyed them (wanting in the Psalm) and crushed them." **That they rose not;** Psalm: "and they *could* not rise," that is, in the hostile sense, rise to further contest. **And they fell under my feet,** = under me, vers. 40, 48; Ps. xlv. 6; xlvii. 4 [3]. Vers. 38 and 40 present a picture not of subjection and dominion (Hupf.), but of conquering enemies in battle by casting them down and passing over them.—Vers. 40, 41. David declares, however, that he received the victorious might only *from the Lord,* and gives Him praise therefor. **And thou didst gird** me . . . and didst bow my

---

* עֹז after מַחְסִי. On the construction see Ewald, § 291 *b*.

† וַיַּתֵּר from נָתַר — תּוּר, Prov. xii. 26, "lead," — יָתֵר (comp. Ges. § 72, Rem. 2).

‡ לְ instead of the usual double Acc. [after לִמֵּד]. נִחַת Piel Perf. of נָחַת "to cause to descend, press down." The Ps. has the fem. נִחֲתָה on account of the זְרוֹעֹתַי, sing. Fem. with plu. subject of things or beasts (Ges. § 146, 3). Here the sing. masc. because the verb precedes.

§ נַחֵת Piel Infin.

‖ [This (or "*copper*") is a better rendering than "*brass*" or "*steel*;" see Art. *Brass* in Smith's *Bib.-Dict.*—Tr.]

* עֲנוֹת, Sept. ὑπακοή. Olshausen conjectures עֶזְרָתְךָ, but "unnecessarily" (Hupf.). The Psalm: עַנְוַתְךָ.

† Instead of תַּחְתֵּנִי the Ps. has תַּחְתָּי.

‡ Aorists followed by Perfects and Futures [they are not Futures, but Aorists.—Tr.].—The lengthened form אֶרְדְּפָה may without ו consec. (as in Prov. vii. 7) express past time, as is frequent in poetry, comp. ver. 12 here and in the Psalm (Böttch.).

opponents under me;* literally, "didst make them bend the knee."—**And my enemies, thou madest them turn the back to me**; literally, "thou gavest† them to me as neck [nape]."—Vers. 42, 43. The enemy look in vain to the Lord for help. They *looked out* to the Lord (comp. Isa. xvii. 7, 8); the Psalm has: "they cried." The *enemies* are not to be regarded as Israelites, because they looked to the help of the Lord (Riehm in Hupf.); the heathen also in extreme need might well expect deliverance from the God of Israel, comp. 1 Sam. v. 7; vi. 5; John ii. 14.—**And I rubbed them to pieces** (pulverized them) **as dust of the earth**, comp. Gen. xiii. 16; Isa. xl. 12, their power was changed into impotence. The Psalm has: "as dust before the wind," combining the two images of the beating the enemy to dust, and scattering them as dust is scattered by the wind, comp. Isa. xxix. 5; xli. 2.—**As the dust of the streets I did trample‡ and stamp them to pieces** (the Psalm: "I emptied them out.") The stamping of the dirt of the street is the symbol of a contemptuous treatment and rejection of what is in itself worthless. Comp. Isa. x. 6; Zech. x. 5. The description of the contest against the enemies under the guidance and help of the Lord is completed by the representation of their total destruction.

Vers. 44–46. The *result* of this conflict with enemies, namely, sovereign dominion over them, and their humble subjection under his royal power.—Ver. 44. **Thou didst deliver me out of the wars of my people** (or, of peoples). Since only external wars§ are spoken of in the preceding and succeeding context, it is not at all allowable to understand internal dissensions here (Hitz., Hengst., Del., Keil). That would break the connection, and destroy the continuity of advance in the description of David's relation to external enemies up to the point of complete dominion over them by the Lord's help.—The "wars of my people" are the wars that his people had to carry on against other nations under his lead; as he has previously spoken of them as *his* wars, so now he regards them as his *people's*. He was doubtless led to this by thinking of his position as king and head of his people, from which position he saw as the result of his wars the subjection of the heathen nations to his royal authority.—If we take the form (עַמִּי) as plural,* = "peoples," then the "wars of *peoples*" are wars carried on by Israel with foreign nations, "wars between peoples," in contrast with the internal conflicts, the fortunate conclusion of which has been before described (Riehm in Hupfeld).—David embraces all the Lord's helps in these wars in this brief exclamation, in order to declare how, as a consequence, the Lord has made him head over these nations. **Thou didst preserve me** (in the Psalm more simply: didst make me) **to be head of the heathen**, preserved me that I should become their head. This reading connects the previous declaration of deliverance with the following statement of the servitude of the nations better than that of the Psalm, because it directs attention to David's dangers in those wars.—**A people** (= peoples) **that I knew not serves** (serve) **me**.—The collective sense "peoples" (עַם) is to be taken here, as above, on account of the parallelism with the plural "nations" [Eng. A. V.: heathen]; not: "people, folks" (Hupfeld). "The Verb (Impf.) is to be rendered as Present, since the idea of the 'head of the nations' is developed" (Hupf.). Comp. chap. viii.—Ver. 45. **Sons of strangeness**, that is, those strange (foreign) nations; the "foreign" answers to the "I knew not" of the preceding verse—**fawn on me** (lit.: lie† to me), they pay fawning, hypocritical homage, while their heart is full of hate and rage [Eng. A. V.: submit to me].—**At the hearing of the ear they obeyed me**.—The usual explanation is: "at the mere report of me and my victories, before my arrival, they submitted themselves," based on Job xlii. 5, where the "hearing of the ear" stands in contrast with the "seeing of the eyes;" against which is, that David in the immediately preceding statement of the "fawning" of the enemy, and in the above description of their subjection *pre-supposes* his personal presence, and the reflexive (Niphal‡) verb "obeyed" exhibits personal obedience to a personal command. We therefore render (with Böttcher and Hupf.): "at the hearing of the ear (= when they heard the command) they showed themselves obedient to me," comp. Isa. xi. 3. Hengstenberg's passive rendering: "who were heard to me by the hearing of the ear," that is, of whom I knew previously only by hearsay, is forced and ambiguous. The two members of ver. 45 stand in the Psalm in the reverse order.—Ver. 46. **Withered away**, all physical strength and moral courage left them, they became dull and

---

* תְּזְרֵנִי for תְּאַזְּרֵנִי (as in the Ps.) Piel with א omitted, as in יֹרֵב for יַאֲרֵב (1 Sam. xv. 5) and מַלְּפֵנוּ for מְאַלְּפֵנוּ (Job xxxv. 11), Ew. § 232 b.—קָמַי — קָמִים עָלַי, Ps. xcii. 12 [11], comp. ver. 49; Ex. xv. 7; Deut. xxxiii. 11. Even where the verb is found only with a Preposition, the Participle has sometimes a Genitive with it. Ges. § 135,, 1, Rem.

† תַּתָּה for נָתַתָּה (so in the Ps.), "an elsewhere impossible shortening, to be at the best excused by the fact that this verb drops its נ in the Imperf." (Ew. § 195 c). Comp. יָרַד — רַד, Judg. xix. 11.—נָתַן עֹרֶף, usually intrans. "to turn the back" (2 Chr. xxix. 6, comp. Josh. vii. 8, 12), here and Ex. xxiii. 27 trans. "to make as neck" — to put to flight. Comp. Ps. xxi. 13 [12] שִׁית שֶׁכֶם "to make into a back (shoulder)."

‡ אֲדִקֵּם, from דָּקַק "to make thin, crush." The Ps.: אֲרִיקֵם.

§ רִיב, properly "legal contest," then "contest" in general; a "contest of peoples" must be war.

* As in Ps. cxliv. 2, and מִנִּי "strings" for מִנִּים Psa. xlv. 9 [8]. On such shortening of *im* to *i* (as the Dual ־ַיִם to ־ַי, Ezek. xiii. 18 יָדַי) comp. Ges. § 87, 1 b, Ew. § 177 a; Ewald regards the עַמִּי here as certainly a plural.—The Sing. עַם in the Psalm is not — "men, folks" (Hupf.), but is collective, as in the last clause of this verse, Job xxxiv. 30 and Isa. xlii. 6.

† Hithpael; the Ps. has Piel (and so Ps. lxvi. 3; lxxxi. 16 [15]); Deut. xxxiii. 29 has Niphal. [It may be considered doubtful whether the notion of hypocrisy enters here; it is not improbably an oriental expression for complete submission.—Tr.]

‡ Instead of the usual Qal; perhaps we should point it Qal. The Niph. occurs in this sense.—The Psalm has לְשֵׁמַע אֹזֶן instead of לִשְׁמוֹעַ א׳.

wretched (comp. Ex. xviii. 18). In the next clause the Psalm has "trembled" [= came trembling], while our passage (unless it be an error of copyist for the Psalm-word*) has: "they hobble (their strength being broken) out of their enclosures (or, fortresses);" it is not to be rendered: "they gird themselves (in order to come forth)" (Hengst. [Phil.]), since this does not accord with the representation here given of voluntary subjection. The reference of the words to "prisons and bonds," into which the strangers are thrown as "refractory" (Böttcher) is against the connection, which speaks only of unconditional obedience and complete subjection of enemies. Rather there is supposed here the wretched condition produced by a long siege; the enemy come out of the fastnesses, in which they have long been cooped up, in miserable condition, in order to submit themselves to the victor.—[Eng. A. V. adopts the Psalm-text: "shall be afraid," and so Erdmann in his translation: "tremble," and this is perhaps preferable, comp. Micah vii. 17.—In vers. 45, 46, Erdmann renders the verbs Present in his translation (fawn, obey, wither, tremble), while in the Exposition he makes them Aorist (fawned, *etc.*); the former is better.—Tr.]

Vers. 47–51. *Conclusion* of the song. On the ground of the deliverances he has experienced (here briefly recapitulated from the content in a number of epithets) David first again *praises God* (vers. 47–49), as in the beginning of the song. To this phrase, which looks to the past, he adds the *vow of thanksgiving* (vers. 50, 51), looking beyond Israel to the salvation to come to the heathen, and prophesying the fulfilment for all time of the promises given to him, God's Anointed, and to his seed.

Ver. 47. "Living is the Lord." So must the phrase (" חַי) be rendered, and not optatively: "long live Jehovah," transferring (as most modern expositors do) the usual formula of homage: "long live the king" (xvi. 16; 1 Sam. x. 24; 1 Kin. i. 25, 39; 2 Kings xi. 12) to God as king of Israel. That formula (יְחִי הַמֶּלֶךְ) relates to the mortality of the king. Our phrase is the standing oath-formula [as the Lord liveth, by the life of Jehovah], and always assumes life [vitality] to be exclusively an attribute of God. Here only the formula is not an oath, but a declaration: living is the Lord!—an exclamation in the tone of a doxology. Comp. 1 Tim. vi. 16: "God, who alone has immortality." God is here called living not in contrast with the idols of the heathen (v. Leng., Hengstenberg), to which there is no allusion in the context, but in reference to the enemies and dangers from which God saved him. And so the two following exclamations are simply declarations of the being of God as it has been revealed in the preceding experiences of the singer. **Blessed (praised), my rock!** (see ver. 2).—**Exalted is the rock-God of my salvation.**—The Psalm has merely: "The God of my salvation." The "*exalted*" is to be taken not subjectively (exalted by the praise offered Him), but objectively, exalted in His own majesty and might (Ps. xlvi. 11 [10]; xxi. 14 [13]; lvii. 6, 12 [5, 11]). Not: "*be* he exalted"* [so Eng. A. V.] *The rock-God of my salvation* = the rock-like God, who brings me salvation; comp. ver. 3. To the three *declarations* of what God *is*, answer, in vers. 48, 49 the statements of God's *deeds*, wherein David has learned what He is to *him*, and wherein He has shown Himself to be the living, rock-firm and exalted God. Here God's deeds of deliverance (as described in vers. 5–20, 29–46) are briefly brought together. — Ver. 48. **The God that avenges me.**—This shows that God lives, inasmuch as He does not leave His servant as a guilty man in the power of the enemy, but manifests his innocence by executing vengeance† for him. In Ps. xciv. 1 God is "the God of vengeance." **And subjects** (lit.: makes come down) **nations under me.**—The Psalm has: "drives‡ [or subdues] nations under me" (the expression is found elsewhere only in Psalm xlvii. 4 [3]).—Ver. 49. **Who brought me forth from my enemies** (comp. ver. 20).—Psalm: "delivered me." [In ver. 48 Dr. Erdmann renders the verbs in past time (*gave, subdued*) in his translation; the time can be determined only from the context; here the present seems better.—Tr.] **And from my adversaries thou liftedst me on high**—that is, on a rock, pregnant construction for: thou liftedst me up and thereby savedst me from my enemies. The declaratory discourse here passes into address. **From the man of violent deeds thou savedst me.**—Instead of the unusual plural (Ps. cxl. 2, 5 [1, 4]) the Ps. has the Sing. "man [or, men] of violence." Most expositors take the phrase collectively: "*men of violences*," (as Prov. iii. 31) of a whole class of enemies. But it accords better with this conclusion and with the whole content of the song to refer the phrase to Saul, who is also expressly mentioned in the superscription. In ver. 47 David declares in general what God is to him, and how He has announced and attested Himself to him in all His deeds of deliverance; then in ver. 48 he looks at God's help against external enemies ("thou broughtest down nations under me"), comp. vers. 29–46; in ver. 49 he recalls the deliverances of the Sauline persecution. With the thought of Saul, whose rejection by the Lord was the cause of his enmity to the Lord's Anointed called in in his stead, connects itself naturally in David's mind (on the ground of the Lord's choice) the thought of the salvation that God has bestowed on him as His Anointed, and—of this he is sure—will also further bestow on him and his seed. This salvation He will also proclaim among the heathen, that they along with Israel may share therein.

Vers. 50, 51. The "therefore" attaches the declaration in these verses as a consequence to the

---

* The Psalm has the ἅπ. λεγ. חָרַג (Chald. חרגא) "to be frightened," = רָגַז "tremble" (in Mic. vii. 17 in the same connection). Our passage has חָגַר, perhaps error for חרג; if it be correct, it is not "gird" (which does not suit the connection), but (with Hitz., Del., Böttch., Then.) after the Aramaic, = "halt, hobble" (Talmud. חִגֵּר "lame").

* This would require יָרֻם instead of יָרוּם.

† נְקָמוֹת always in the plural. "To take" vengeance, נָתַן here and iv. 8, עָשָׂה Judg. xi. 36; Ezek. xxv. 17.

‡ הִדְבִּיר.

preceding summary laudation of God's deeds of salvation. David here expresses a resolution and a *vow* ever to praise the Lord's name. This *vow of thanksgiving* he so presents that he 1) expressly declares his praise (by the *therefore*) to be a thank-offering *due* to the Lord, also his rightful fruit from the preceding experiences of his salvation. **To thy name will I sing.**—The *name* of God is here the concept [or representative] of all His deeds of deliverance, whereby He has revealed Himself as his God and his people's, as which David has hitherto praised him. 2) David declares the *extent* to which he will proclaim the praise of his God: **I will praise thee, O Lord, among the nations.**—The nations are not only to be subdued by force, but are now to learn to know the living God of Israel and His salvation; His praise is therefore not to be confined to the land of Israel, but to be proclaimed among the heathen. This presumes that He is the God of the heathen also, and that they are called to share in the salvation revealed to Israel. Comp. Ps. ix. 12 [11]; lvii. 10 [9]; xcvi. 3, 10; cv. 1; Isa. xii. 4. In proof of this truth Paul (Rom. xv. 9) quotes this passage along with Ps. cxvii. 1, and Deut. xxxii. 43.—3) As the ground of his vow David declares the Lord's promise of good to Him, and his seed (ver. 51). "Who makes great the salvation of his king," literally: "salvations," the plural indicating the manifoldness and richness of the salvation. The marginal reading: "fullness of salvation" is a singular conjecture,* and must be rejected; it is obviously instead of the similar form, = "tower," Ps. lxi. 4 [3]; Prov. xviii. 10 [Eng. A. V. also adopts this reading "tower," against which, however, are all the ancient versions and the best Heb. manuscripts.—Tr.]. The text, = "he who makes great," is to be retained. It refers to the fullness of salvation (certainly to be expected on the ground of the divine promises) that the Lord will bestow in ever increasing richness on *His king*, the theocratic ruler that He has called and inducted, who regards himself only as God's instrument. God's "grace [mercy]" is the source of his "manifestations of salvation." A *threefold prophetic declaration* of the *future factual proof* of this grace to His Anointed, is here expressed: a. David affirms that he is sure of it for *himself;* the "to David" stands independently, not, as Hengst. says, along with "and to his seed" as definition of the "to his anointed;" b. the promised salvation will, however, be extended to *his seed* also. The direct reference of these words to the promise in 2 Sam. vii. 12-16 is apparent; on the ground of this promise David declares the certainty of continuance through his heirs, of the dominion of his house; c. the testimony of praise culminates in the prophecy of the *everlasting duration* of God's manifestations of grace and blessing, which will be imparted to David, and his seed according to the promise. Comp. 2 Sam. vii. 15, 16.

Hupfeld rejects these closing words: "to David and to his seed forevermore" as a later addition to the song (in so far as it is to be ascribed to David) on the following grounds: 1) David would not have spoken of himself by the phrase: "to David," and 2) not David, but only a later adherent of the Davidic dynasty could have said: "and to his seed forevermore." But these grounds are not valid; for in fact David does call himself by name in xxiii. 1, and in the prayer 2 Sam. vii. 20, 26; and how can the reference to his seed and its continuance be regarded as not Davidic, when David was assured of the perpetuity of the royal dominion of his family by the promise 2 Sam. vii. 12 sqq.?—Thenius' supposition, that the words may have been an afterwards added bit of flattery to David's posterity, can be explained only by a complete ignoring of David's hope based on that promise 2 Sam. vii., and receives at best meagre support from the very subjective argument that the two preceding clauses sufficed to express the author's thought.—Böttcher regards the whole of ver. 51 as a later addition in imitation of other Davidic conclusions to songs "as homage to the royal house." But his *affirmation* that this does not accord with genuine Davidic productions is set aside by the *fact* that ideas, and even words here agree with David's words in 2 Sam. vii. He further contends that by the retention of ver. 51 the probably significant number [50] is exceeded; but (apart from his "probably,")—the untenableness of this conjecture is strikingly shown by his manipulation of ver. 3 into two verses in order (after the omission of ver. 51) to get 50 verses besides the superscription, while the retention of ver. 51 gives this number already.

On the *mutual relation of the two recensions* of this song in Ps. xviii. and 2 Sam. xxii., critics are very much divided. Hengstenberg's view (which is that of the older expositors)—that the two texts are two different recensions of the same song by David himself, both equally authentic and good, the Psalm being the original, and the 2 Sam. the later—is altogether untenable in the face of the not few variations that are obviously *unintended*, *accidental*, and are to be referred to the *carelessness of the written tradition* or *the uncertainty of the oral*. Thus the carelessness of a transcriber is shown in the interchange of certain letters in vers. 11, 43 (ד and ר), ver. 33 (נ and ר), ver. 12 (ר and כ), and the omission of words in vers. 13, 36, where the text of the Psalm is complete.—The question as to the originality of the two texts is to be decided by examination of the *intentional changes*. And to such intentional changes is to be referred a long list of deviations in the *Psalm*-text as Sommer (Bibl. Abh. I. pp. 167-173, Bonn, 1846) has convincingly shown in detail. "We find," he remarks," occasional free change of text in order to remove possible difficulties, to make clear, by the expression, the antiquated writing, the grammatical forms, and, where it can be easily done, to put what is usual and known in place of what is peculiar in conception or language. For the same reason that the transcriber of the Psalm abandoned the ancient sparseness of vowel-letters (Ges. Lehrg. p. 51) and, where it seemed necessary, carefully inserted a *Waw* or *Yod*, he has resolved and regularly inflected the contracted verbal forms, and here and there separated a preposition from a noun, in order to facilitate the apprehension of the words (which were written without vowel-signs) and

* מְגְדּוֹל, after מִגְדַּל of Ps. lxi. 4. The text is מַגְדִּיל, Hiph. Participle of גָּדַל.

avoid possible misunderstandings." (For particulars see Sommer, as above.) It does not however hence appear, that the preference is to be accorded to the Psalm-text that is given it by the latest critics, Gramberg (in Winer, *Exeg. St.* I. 1), De Wette, Hupfeld, Hitzig, Ewald, Olshausen,* Delitzsch. But neither can the text of 2 Sam. xxii. be regarded as the original, since it contains variations that are explained by careless transcription and tradition (Hupf.), and probably also by the fact that this psalm, incorporated in a *historical* book, shared the fate of all historical texts, care for poetic form and rhythm early yielding to regard for the mere sense (Hitzig). It is, however, characteristic of the text of 2 Sam. xxii., that it contains not a few "licenses of popular language" (Del.), and that the defective mode of writing, which points to higher antiquity, is the prevailing one. On the other hand in the psalm-text (which Böttcher calls the "priest-recension" over against the 2 Sam. xxii. as the "laic recension") a later revision is unmistakable. "The vulgarisms, and in part the archaisms also, are there effaced; the whole style is more cultivated" (Böttch.). Therefore Von Lengerke's view, that the two texts are of about equal value (*comment. crit. de duplici Ps. xviii. exemplo*, Regiom. 1833, 4) cannot be looked on as proven, but the preference is to be given to the recension in 2 Sam. xxii. on account of its stamp of higher antiquity, which Von Lengerke must admit is given it by its more sparing use of vowel signs. The two recensions are independent of one another, neither of them being the authentic; but 2 Sam. xxii. is the older, whether it was taken from an older manuscript (Ewald), or, as Delitzsch supposes, belonged to the "Annals of David" (*Dibre ha-yamim*), one of the sources of the Books of Samuel. Böttcher: "Thus then, the text of Ps. xviii. is, as a whole, *completer* and purer, but 2 Sam. xxii. though somewhat more defective, yet in details *truer* to the original and *archaic form*."

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. This *longest* and *most artistic*† of David's psalms that have come down to us is also one of the most important in respect to the *history of God's kingdom and salvation*. For it embraces all God's deliverances in David's life before and after his accession to the throne, and extols them as proofs of the favor and faithfulness of *his* God, who chose him as his *servant* to this high royal dignity, and gave him the most glorious promises of the permanent duration of his kingdom in his seed. The pillars on which this great royal psalm rests are the two self-revelations of God to David, that determine His theocratic royal position: His *call* to be king in Saul's stead, and the *promise* of the everlasting duration of his kingdom; the first supports that part of the Psalm that refers to the Sauline persecution, the second the part that describes God's help against foreign enemies. Looking on these deliverances as fulfilments of the promise, he expressly refers to it at the close, and at the same time looks to the future with sure hope of the fulfilment of the promise in the imperishable dominion of his house. So Delitzsch [introductory remarks on Ps. xviii.; he compares the Ps. to the Assyrian monumental inscriptions.—Tr.].

2. Because God's deeds are *incommensurable* for human feeling and apprehension, David's thankful *heart* can find in *language no adequate expression* for them. Hence the exuberant aggregation of terms in vers. 2–4, which set forth the inverse relation of human capacity for praise to God's manifestations of grace. "The poet begins a lay, in which he wishes to praise God for His help, the strength given him to do great deeds, his elevation to be king over nations, for all the blessings of his long and eventful life. Here at the outset the recollection of these exceeding mercies comes over his soul with overwhelming force; he can find no satisfactory term wherewith to call on the God of his salvation, and therefore piles term on term" (Sommer, as above, p. 152).

3. The *praise* of God's name is not only *fruit*, but also *root* of *prayer* (ver. 4); for the *experiences* of God's *grace* and *faithfulness*, which impel to praise, also *strengthen faith*, are the *foundations of hope* for further *mercies*, *assure* the fulfilment of *promises* in the *future*, and warrant fervent prayer for new help under *appeal* to past blessings.

4. *The cordial intercourse of prayer* between the Old Testament saints and their covenant-God (comp. vers. 4–7) is *the factual proof of the positive self-revelation of the personal, living God*, without whose initiative such overspringing of the chasm between the holy God and sinful man were impossible, but also *the most striking refutation* of the false view that the religion of the Old Covenant presents an absolute chasm between God and man. *The real life-communion* between the heart that goes immediately to its God in prayer and the God who hears such prayer is, on the one hand, in contrast with the extra-testamental religion of the pre-Christian world alone founded on God's positive-historical self-revelation to His people and the thereby established covenant-relation between them, and, on the other hand, as sporadic anticipation of the life-communion with God established by the New Testament Mediator, it is a *factual prophecy* of the religious-ethical life-communion (culminating in prayer) between man redeemed by Christ and His Heavenly Father.

5. *Nature*, as God's creature and man's fellow-creature, is the symbolical *means* for the figurative presentation of the personal self-revelation of God to man. The images derived from the *light*, which is God's garment (Ps. civ. 2), the *cloud*, which is called His tent (Job xxxvi. 29; Ps. xcvii. 2), the *thunder*, in which His voice is heard (Ps. xviii. 14 [13]; Job xxxvii. 2), the *lightning* and fire-flames, wherein burns His wrath and punitive justice (Judg. v. 4; Isa. xxx. 27 sq.; Ps. l. 2, 3; lxviii. 8; xcvii. 2), and the *earthquake*, the terror that precedes the revelation of His judgment (Ps. lxxvii. 19 [18]; cxiv. 4; Joel ii. 10; iv. 16; Nah. i. 5; Isa. xxiv. 18) exhibit those sides of the being of the self-revealing God to which natural phenomena, by

* [Justus Olshausen (to be distinguished from Hermann Olshausen, the commentator on the N. T.), writer of the Commentary on Psalms in the Condensed Exegetical Manual, a good grammarian, but hyperskeptical as a critic.—Tr.]

† Amyraldus: "a most excellent specimen of the poetic art;" Hitzig: "an unequalled product of art and reflection."

virtue of their divine origin, are related. "This symbolism of nature rests on the conception that certain qualities in God's being and work answer to it. Hence God is sometimes represented as present and efficient in these natural phenomena (not merely accompanied by them), and in bold and vivid expression the rousing and utterance of His anger is portrayed as the kindling of His light-nature in all the turns of fiery and flaming figures, even to the point that smoke issues from His wrath-snorting nose (Deut. xix. 9; Ea. lxxiv. 1; lxxx. 5 [4]) and devouring fire from His mouth (comp. the description of the crocodile, Job xli. 10 sqq.) from the burning coals within Him. Not in themselves, therefore, but only under certain circumstances and limitations do these phenomena of nature form in part the symbol, in part the means of the theophany" (Moll [in Lange's *Bible-Work*] on Ps. xviii., Doct. and Eth. 5).—"All nature stands in a relation of sympathy to man, in that it shares his curse and blessing, ruin and glory, and in a (so to speak) synergetic [co-operative] relation to God, in that it pre-announces and instrumentally accomplishes His mighty deeds" (Delitzsch on Ps. xviii. 8–10).

6. *The law of God's retributive righteousness is the fundamental law of the divine government of the world.* The condition of man's deliverance by God is *life in righteousness before God*, which *pre-supposes* full devotion of heart to God, and *shows itself* in earnest striving after faithful fulfillment of God's commands. God bestows His salvation and blessing on the faithful righteous (comp. Deut. xxviii.); on the apostate wicked he sends His judgments, and hears not their cry for help, because, they being in trouble, turn to Him not in living faith and trust, but in superstition. He who (like David), with heart, life and desire turned towards God, seeks and finds in life-communion with Him his highest good and complete satisfaction, may (with David), on the ground of this law of retributive righteousness, affirm that he has had help of the Lord, because God cannot leave without proof of His faithful mercy those who trust in Him and in His word without wishing to gain or lay claim to merit for themselves. Self-praise, indeed, and vain self-contemplation in such an appeal to one's own righteousness is not lawful; and it is here excluded, since David expressly declares that pride is the object of the divine judgment (ver. 28). Comp. Isa. ii. 11; Prov. vi. 17. *This humble appeal* to one's righteous walk before God under God's guidance is indeed at bottom only *praise* to God Himself. For the righteousness, wherein one walks before God, is God's own work. "David owes his righteousness wholly to his faithful adherence to God, who preserves His servant from sins so that they do not rule over him.—He here dwells on his righteousness, not from vain self-contemplation, but to quicken himself and others to zeal in the fulfillment of the law.—The charge of pride of virtue, if it were true, would lie also against many expressions of Christian hymn-writers. So, for example, in Anton Ulrich's fine hymn: Nun tret' ich wieder aus der Ruh, the strophe: So ist getrost mein frischer Muth,—Mein Gott geht nimmer meinen Steg, wo ich nicht wandle seinen Weg [never goes my God my path, when I walk not in His way]" (Hengst. on Ps. xviii. 20).

7. To this truth of the retributive righteousness of God attaches itself as further ground for it (vers. 26, 27) the thought of *ethical reciprocal action* between God in His ethical bearing towards man, and man in his ethical position in respect to God. There is no question here of an intellectual conception of God's being, as if David meant to say: God appears to every man according as the man is disposed and constituted. Certainly the history of religion everywhere (Christian and non-Christian) proves that the views of God that the unaided reason arrives at are the reflection of the ethical condition of soul, which determines the intellect; the character of the knowledge of God depends on the ethical character of the whole life. Here, however, is expressed the truth that God's objective, real conduct towards men according to His retributive righteousness corresponds exactly to man's ethical conduct towards God, and by the reflection of this righteous conduct of God, as exhibited in His punitive judgments, in man's perverted mind arises a caricature of God's nature, which is more and more confirmed and filled out in the conception of the man that turns from God and continues to harden his heart against Him. Comp. Moll, on Ps. xvii., Doct. and Eth. 6; who refers to 1 Sam. xxvi. 33; Isa. xxix. 14; xxxi. 3; Job v. 13; Prov. iii. 34. [This last view, the perverted conception of God in men's minds, while correct in itself, is not contained in this Psalm.—Tr.].

8. In the gracious helps, wherein God reveals Himself to His people as the living one, *faith* in the *living God* grows to the ever completer *knowledge* of the truth that God is the Living One in the absolute sense, and finds involuntary utterance in the declaration: "Living is the Lord" (ver. 47). The experiences and guidances of the lives of God's children are the proof that God is a living God, who enters into their life with His light and His strength, with the consolation of His love and the help of His might." "That David is living, exalted and blest, shows that *his* God is living, exalted and to be blessed. He is the living proof of *his* livingness, exaltedness and praiseworthiness" (Hengst.).

9. The jubilant tone in which Old Testament piety speaks of *revenge* on enemies lacks the thorough sanctification and consecration, whose only source is in the holy love of God, poured out by the Holy Ghost (Rom. v. 5) in the hearts of those who are become children of God through faith in Jesus Christ, and can practice that love of enemies that was necessarily still foreign to the Old Testament standpoint. But while this difference between the standpoints of the Old and New Testaments is maintained, the relative truth and justification of these utterances of David on revenge on enemies (ver. 48 sq.) must not be ignored. For David here speaks in the consciousness of his calling as theocratic king, who had to fight for the Lord's people, and carry on the Lord's wars; it is the Lord Himself that has taken the revenge and given it him; the victories that have laid at his feet the enemies of God's kingdom are the Lord's own deeds. And this is the prefigurement and symbol of God's mighty deeds in the defence of the New Testament kingdom of grace, and of the conquest of the hostile world by the

spiritual weapons of His word and the power of His Spirit, till after this conquest comes the triumphant kingdom of glory.

10. David affirms (ver. 50 sq.) the *universality of the salvation*, whose original source is the glorious revelations of God to His chosen people; the God of Israel is also the God *of the heathen*. The means of bringing them to the knowledge of the living God is not the sword, but the proclamation of God's great deeds for His people. As David, in his character of missionary to the heathen world, praises his God's grace, so at bottom all missionary work among the heathen is, in the announcement of the word of the God who is revealed in Christ, a continuous praise of the name of the living God. In David's word: "I will praise thee among the heathen," the missionary idea of the universal, all-embracing salvation of God breaks over the bounds of national-theocratic particularism.—"As it was among the heathen that he himself most proudly sang Jahve's praise, and by his whole life proclaimed to them His sole majesty (wherein he followed, only with far more power, Deborah's example, Judg. v. 3), so from now on could and should every member of this congregation of Jahve take position towards the heathen" [Ewald, *Gesch.* [Hist. of Israel] III. 273, Rem.).

11. As the centre, whence the light of salvation was to shine on the heathen, David has in view God's revelations of salvation and grace, as they were imparted to him, the Anointed of the Lord, and, according to the promise, 2 Sam. vii., were to be imparted to his seed that was destined to everlasting royal dominion. But the line, in which his prophetic glance at the end of the Song in the light of this promise looks into the future of this seed, runs in the historical fulfilment of this Messianic prophecy beyond the earthly throne of the Davidic house, and ends in "the Son of God, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Rom. i. 3), and is the Anointed of God in the absolute sense. In Rom. xv. 9 Paul, quoting David's words here (ver. 50), declares him to be the Saviour, through whom, according to God's mercy, the heathen also become partakers of salvation, and praise God therefor.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1. [TAYLOR: Let us learn to thank God for our mercies and deliverances. When the crisis of some great agony is on us, there are no words which leap so readily to our lips as these: "God help me!" At such times we feel shut up to go to God, and we engage our friends to pray to Him on our behalf. But when the danger is past and the suffering is gone, how seldom we think of Him on whom, while they lasted, we called so passionately for relief Of the ten lepers whom Jesus cleansed, only one returned to give Him thanks.—HENRY: Every new mercy in our hand should put a new song into our mouth, even praises to our God.—TR.]—Ver. 2. Human speech cannot find words enough to praise sufficiently the fulness of the divine grace and the riches of God's goodness. Comp. Rom. xi. 33.—God not merely *gives* to them that trust in Him all that is necessary for them, but He *Himself is* to them all that they need. The Lord is to His people through His power a firm support, an invincible ally both in defence and in offence. [SPURGEON:* "In Him will I trust." Faith must be exercised, or the preciousness of God is not truly known; and God must be the object of faith, or faith is mere presumption.—TR.]

Ver. 4 sq. The praise of God has its ground in the benefits received from God and in the experience of His salvation; it forms the foundation for new requests, it confirms the heart in child-like confidence, and it heightens the courage of faith.—The wholesome fruit of severe afflictions and sore conflicts is for the children of God so much the more unconditional confidence in God's compassion, so much the more hearty supplication for God's help, so much the more blessed experience of His hearing and delivering grace.—God speaks to men through the powers and gifts of His visible creation the language of His goodness and compassionate fatherly love, Matt. v. 45; but He also speaks through the mighty forces of nature the language of His wrath and His punitive righteousness.—BERL. B.: The Lord is such a soul's rock; for it has no other steadfastness than God, who establishes Himself in it and confirms it in perfect immovableness, for it is the immovableness of God Himself.—LUTHER: David wishes hereby to instruct us that there is nothing so bad, so great, so vast, so mighty, so lasting that it cannot be overcome through the power of God, if we only trust therein; likewise that then especially should we have cause to hope for God's power to become mighty in us, when many great, strong and persistent evils powerfully press upon us.—"I call on the Lord, who is worthy to be praised." This is in time of trouble the noblest of doctrines, and thoroughly golden. It is incredible what a powerful means such praise to God is when danger assails. For as soon as you begin to praise God, so soon the evil becomes lessened, the consoled spirit waxes stronger, and there follows the calling on God with confidence.

Ver. 7. [LORD BACON (in Spurgeon): If you listen even to David's harp, you shall hear as many hearse-like airs as carols. Prosperity is not without many fears and distastes; and adversity is not without comforts and hopes.-TR.]—CRAMER: It is God's counsel and will that we should call on Him. Ps. l. 15.—CALVIN: In naming God *his* God, he distinguishes himself from the coarse despisers of God and from the hypocrites, who do indeed when pressed by need call confusedly on the heavenly divinity, but do not either with confidence or with one heart draw near to God, of whose fatherly grace they know nothing.—BERL. B.: If thy God has now heard thee, O thou afflicted king, instruct us also how it has gone therewith and with thy cry and prayer for deliverance. [SPURGEON: There was no great space between the cry and its answer. The Lord is not slack concerning His promise, but is swift to rescue His afflicted.—TR.]

Ver. 8 sq. SCHLIER: How poor we are when surrounded by cold, heartless nature, and how well off we are when everywhere we can see and mark the Lord's hand. Let us see the Lord's

* [This and the other quotations from Spurgeon throughout the chapter are from his "Treasury of David," a copious commentary on the Psalms, which does not aim at criticism or exact exegesis, but is rich in homiletical matter, original and selected.—TR.]

hand even in the events of common life.—STARKE: All God's creatures testify of His glory, Ps. xix. 2 sq.: all the elements have to be at His command.—SCHLIER: The Lord helps if we pray aright. [SPURGEON: Things were bad for David before he prayed, but they were much worse for his foes so soon as the petition had gone up to heaven.—TR.]

Vers. 18 sqq. HENGSTENBERG: "For they were too strong for me"—here it is assumed that our utter lack of might compels the Lord to make use of His almightiness for our benefit.—STARKE: Every victory comes from God; He is the true man of war. Exod. xv. 3; Ps. xlvi. 10 [9].—Human help commonly fails; but he who leans upon God as a strong staff is never put to shame. Ps. xxiii. 4. BERL. B.: After all sufferings endured there is given the soul a holy freedom, and it gains through its trial a boundless enlargement. This it never recognizes until after the work is finished and God has delivered it from all its pains. And why has He delivered it from them? Because this soul has pleased Him.—S. SCHMID: Believers find their best consolation and motive to patience in the knowledge that they please God. 1 Pet. iii. 14.

Vers. 21 sqq. HENGSTENBERG: With all the weakness common to men they yet fall apart into two great halves, between which a great gulf is fixed, the wicked and the righteous, and only the latter can be heard when they pray.—CRAMER: In all persecution, hostility and opposition we should labor to have always a good conscience; for that is our rejoicing, 2 Cor. i. 12; Acts xxiv. 16.—STARKE: A beautiful description of a true Christian. Well for him that strives to attain it. The righteousness of pious Christians pleases God when it proceeds from faith. Rom. v. 1.—[SPURGEON: Before God, the man after God's own heart was a humble sinner; but before his slanderers he could, with unblushing face, speak of the cleanness of his hands and the righteousness of his life. . . . . There is no self-righteousness in an honest man's knowing that he is honest, nor even in his believing that God rewards him in Providence because of his honesty, for such is often a most evident matter of fact. . . . . It is not at all an opposition to the doctrine of salvation by grace, and no sort of evidence of a Pharisaic spirit, when a gracious man, having been slandered, stoutly maintains his integrity, and vigorously defends his character. . . . . . Read the cluster of expressions in this and the following verses as the song of a good conscience, after having safely outridden a storm of obloquy, persecution and abuse, and there will be no fear of our upbraiding the writer as one who sets too high a price upon his own moral character.—HENRY (ver. 23): A careful abstaining from our own iniquity is one of the best evidences of our own integrity; and the testimony of our conscience that we have done so, will be such a rejoicing, as will not only lessen the griefs of an afflicted state, but increase the comforts of an advanced state. David reflected with more comfort upon his victories over his own iniquity, than upon his conquest of Goliath, and all the hosts of the uncircumcised Philistines; and the witness of his own heart to his uprightness was sweeter, though more silent music than theirs that sang, "David has slain his ten thousands." If a great man be a good man, his goodness will be much more his satisfaction than his greatness.—TR.]—As we are disposed towards God, so is also God disposed towards us; and as we show ourselves towards Him so He also shows Himself towards us. 1 Sam. ii. 30; xv. 23; Matt. x. 33; Luke vi. 37.—Ver. 27. DELITZSCH: The pious man's inward love God requites with intimate love, the honest man's complete devotion with full communication of grace, the striving after purity by a disposition rich in undisturbed love (comp. Psa. lxxiii. 1), moral self-perversion by strange judgments, in that He gives up the perverse man to his perverseness (Rom. i. 28), and leads him along strange ways to final condemnation. (Isa. xxix. 14, comp. Lev. xxvi. 23 sq.).—BERL. B.: For this very reason does that which is most righteous, seem to the perverse world to be perverse and unrighteous, because the world is perverse and this does not agree with its evil principles. God is in their estimation too righteous and exact, because He tests with the greatest accuracy the distortions of a dislocated conscience, and investigates such a case with the severest strictness, as the Gospel explains of Him who had buried His talent. [SPURGEON: The Jewish tradition was that the manna tasted according to each man's mouth; certainly God shows Himself to each individual according to his character.—TR.]—Ver. 28. DELITZSCH: The church that is bowed down by sufferings experiences God's condescension for her salvation, and her haughty oppressors experience God's exaltation for their humbling.

Ver. 29. S. SCHMID: He whose light is the Lord, walks safe in his ways. John xi. 9, 10.—Vers. 30 sq. Nothing in the world is so hard and heavy that we cannot get the better of it by God's help. Rom. viii. 37.—BERL. B.: All that is a hindrance to men is to God no hindrance.—O how hemmed in we are when in ourselves. Ah! how enlarged are we not, when we find ourselves in Thee, O my God. Then we run, and nothing can stop or overthrow us.—STARKE: If we have done great things, we must ascribe the honor not to ourselves but to God. Psa. cxv. 1.—Ver. 32. S. SCHMID: Well for the man that can in true faith call the Lord his God. Psa. xviii. 2, 3.—Vers. 33 sq. CRAMER: War is not in itself sinful nor blameworthy, and God makes righteous soldiers. Psa. cxliv. 1.—S. SCHMID: Ye warriors of Jesus Christ, who have to contend with princes and mighty ones (Eph. vi. 12), call God to your help, who will teach your hands to war.

Ver. 35. HENGSTENBERG: The outward conflict against the enemies of the kingdom of God is not in itself carnal, but becomes so only through the disposition in which it is conducted; just as the spiritual conflict is not in itself spiritual, but only when it is conducted with divine weapons alone, with the power which God supplies. With right does Luther find in our verse the promise, "that to preachers who are taught by God Himself, there is given an inexhaustible and invincible power to withstand all opposers." This is therein contained not merely inasmuch as what holds of one believer, also holds of all others, but more directly too, inasmuch as David here speaks not merely of himself but of

his whole family, which is completed in Christ, so that all he says refers in the highest and fullest sense to Christ and His kingdom, and His servants. [A doubtful principle, and a precarious inference.—Tr.]

Vers. 36 sq. Luther: Who are we then, that we should either want to presume and undertake to protect the truth and overcome the enemies, or when we cannot succeed therein, that we should want to get angry about it? It depends upon divine grace how we are preserved and enlarged, not upon our undertakings and presumptuous fancy, that the glory may remain with God alone.—Ver. 38. Luther: And this has happened and still happens in all victories of the people of God, since in the beginning of the conflict the enemies appear to be superior and invincible; but so soon as the assault is made there is a growing strength; the enemies take to flight, and are slain; thereupon the church does not cease to follow up the conflict won and the victory gained, until it sweeps away all enemies.

Ver. 39. Calvin: As the wars of David are common to us, it follows that to us there is promised an unconquerable protection against all onsets of the devil, all lusts of sin, all temptations of the flesh.—Cramer: Christian knights must not practice hypocrisy with the enemies of God, or show them ill-timed compassion, but use earnestness and zeal against them. 1 Sam. xv. 15; Psa. cxxxix. 21.—Vers. 40 sq. S. Schmid: Nothing is more intolerable to the ungodly than when they are humbled under those over whom they have exalted themselves. [Ver. 42. Spurgeon: Prayer is so notable a weapon that even the wicked will take to it, in their fits of desperation. Bad men have appealed to God against God's own servants, but in vain.—Tr.]

Ver. 47. Berl. B.: The Lord lives! Hence comes all the satisfaction of a true and pure soul, because God is always living in him, and this life of God no one can hinder. Psa. xlii. 3 [2].—This alone constitutes the joy of a soul wholly penetrated by pure love. Its joy consists not in its salvation, but in the glory which from this salvation accrues to God. Exod. xv. 2.—Ver. 50 sq. Starke: A Christian should awake himself ever anew to the praise of God.—Schlier: The more we think on what the Lord has done for us, the more we gain courage and confidence for the future. Ingratitude makes men despairing and afraid; true gratitude produces consolation and courage. In thanksgiving we of course think of the Lord and His goodness; and when we think of the Lord, how should we not also be consoled? The more gratitude, so much the more confidence; and the more confidence, so much the more help for time and eternity.

[Ver. 1. *Songs of deliverance.* 1) A good man may have many enemies; a) external, b) internal ("None betray us into sin, like the foes we find within."). 2) The Lord delivers him from one after another, and will at last deliver him from all. 3) His songs of deliverance; a) for every particular deliverance in the course of life, b) for the great deliverance in the hour of death, c) amid the complete security of the life eternal.—Vers. 5–20. *Great trials and glorious deliverance.* I. The trials. 1) Alarming assaults of wickedness (ver. 5). 2) Imminent perils of death (ver. 6). II. The cry for help. 1) 'In distress' (ver. 7), men always cry out for help. 2) David calls on no human help but on Jehovah. 3) Invoking Him as '*my* God.' 4) His cry was heard. III. The deliverance. 1) Sublime tokens of Jehovah's appearing, in majesty and wrath (vers. 8–14). 2) Enemies vanquished and scattered (ver. 15). 3) The sorely tried one is delivered; a) from calamities in general (vers. 16, 17), b) from powerful enemies choosing the time of calamity to assail (vers. 18, 19). 4) He is brought into great freedom and prosperity (ver. 20).—Tr.]

[Vers. 20–28. A *fearless profession of integrity.* I. Delivered and rewarded because he pleased God (vers. 20–21). II. How he professes to have acted (vers. 22–24). 1) In general, keeping the ways of the Lord (ver. 22). 2) Knowing and obeying His revealed will (ver. 23). 3) Refraining from sin (ver. 24). III. God's retaliations, treating men exactly as they treat Him. (vers. 26–28). (Such a line of thought is quite foreign to our ordinary preaching; but if properly guarded in the statement and application, it might be very wholesome.)—Ver. 32. Jehovah the only God, and God the only rock.—Vers. 47–50. *Praise to the living God.* 1) Jehovah liveth (ver. 47)—not a mere nothing like the idols (Psa. cxv. 2–7)—not a mere idea like the Pantheist's God—but living, personal, active, knowing all, ruling all. 2) As the living God, He delivers and preserves His people (vers. 48, 49). 3) They should praise Him; a) bless Him themselves (ver. 47), and b) make Him known among the nations that know Him not (ver. 50).—Tr.]

FOURTH SECTION.

David's Last Prophetic Words.

Chapter XXIII. 1–7.

1 Now [And] these *be* [are] the last words of David. David the son of Jesse
said, and the man *who was* raised up on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob,
2 and the sweet psalmist of Israel, said. The Spirit of the Lord [Jehovah] spake by
3 me [*or*, into me], and his word was in [on] my tongue. The God of Israel said,
the Rock of Israel spake to me, He that ruleth over men *must be* just, ruling in
4 the fear of God. And *he shall be* as the light of the morning, *when* the sun riseth,
even [*om.* even] a morning without clouds, as the tender grass *springing* out of the
earth by clear shining after rain [when from shining after raining the herb springs
5 from the earth]. Although my house be not so with God; [For is not my house
so with God?] yet [for] he hath made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered
in all things and sure; for *this* is all my salvation, and all *my* desire, although he
make it not to grow [for all my salvation and all my pleasure, shall it not prosper
6 (*or*, shall he not cause it to prosper)?]. But *the sons of* Belial *shall be* [And the
wicked are] all of them as thorns thrust away, because they cannot be taken with
7 hands [for they are not laid hold of with the hand]. But the man *that* shall
[And if a man] touch them, must be [he is] fenced with iron and the staff of a
spear, and they shall be utterly burned with fire in the *same* place.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

These "last words of David" have not a merely lyrical (Ewald), but a lyrical-*prophetical character*. Their *historical pre-supposition* is the prophecy through Nathan, 2 Sam. vii. Their *connection* with the preceding song, chap. xxii., is *not* indeed a *chronological* one, since there is no chronologically definite statement in either; but as both obviously belong (xxii. by its content, xxiii. 1–7 by its title) to David's last years, they cannot lie far apart in time, and both, partly by their *retrospect* of a long and eventful life that rose out of the depths to high honor, partly by their *outlook* into a still more glorious future, have the character of the solemn, grand final words of a king. For an inward connection of the contents of the two songs is clearly to be seen in the fact that the closing view of ch. xxii. (based on the prophecy of an everlasting house, 2 Sam. vii.) traverses and controls this whole song, xxiii. 1–7, that the seed of the Anointed of the Lord (xxii. 51) is here individualized into a *person*, and the salvation there promised as an everlasting possession to the Anointed and his seed by God, is here more definitely announced as one proceeding from and secured by the messianic Ruler.—On the theocratic attitude in the biblical-theological content of this Song, see further in the appropriate section [Historical and Theological].

For the exegesis compare the following literature: Luther on the last words of David, 2 Sam. xxiii. 1–7, *opp.* Jen. VIII. 137–152. Walch III. 2790–2910. Erl. A. Bd. 37, p. 1 sqq.—Pfeiffer, *Dubia Vexata*, pp. 398–401.—Buddeus, *Hist. Eccl. N. T.* I., pp. 194–196.—Crusius, *Hypomnemata* II., pp. 219–224.—Joh. G. Trendelenburg, *Comment. in noviss. verba David*, Göttingen, 1779.—Herder, *Vom Geist der ebr. Poesie*, II. 2, Leipz., 1825, p. 387 sqq., and *Briefe das Studium der Theologie betreffend*, I., p. 135.—Ewald, *Die poet. Bücher des Alt. Bundes* [*Poetical Books of the Old Testament*], I., pp. 99–102, and *Hist. of Israel*, III. 268 (3 ed.).—Vaihinger, *Zur Erklärung des Liedes* 2 *Sam. xxiii.* 1–7, in the *Stud. und Krit.*, 1843, pp. 983 sqq.—Hengstenberg, *Christology of the Old Testament, in loco.* — Reinke, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Alt. Testament*, IV., p. 455 sq. Fries, *Die letzten Worte Davids* 2 *Sam. xxiii.* 1–7, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1857, pp. 645–689.—G. Baur, *Gesch. der alt.-test. Weissagung*, I. 387.—Tholuck, *Die Propheten und ihre Weissagung*, p. 166 sq.—H. Schultz, *Bibl. Theol. des Alt Testament*, I. 463 sq. [Oehler, *Theol. of the Old Testament*, § 230.—Tr.].

Ver. 1. The superscription.—**And these are the last words of David.**—The Davidic *origin* of this song, affirmed by the superscription, is raised above all doubt by the archaic form of the introduction, the pregnant curtness of the expression, the characteristic peculiarity of the thoughts, the Davidic stamp borne by form and

content, and the originality of the Messianic thought, as well as the direct reference of the latter to 2 Sam. vii. "Only hyper-criticism could declare against the Davidic origin by first forming an arbitrary conception of David's poetic style, and then rejecting this song for not coming up to that conception.—A poem that was composed later and put into the mouth of the royal singer would certainly betray its origin by a fuller and clearer exposition of the idea of the Israelitish kingdom" (Baur, as above, p. 388). So H. Schultz, as above, 464. Though the song is by its superscription attached to ch. xxii., the opinion held by some (Mich., Dathe, Maurer), that the "last words" are only words *later* than the song in chap. xxii., is untenable. Nor can the superscription refer to the following history of David, as given in the remaining part of "Samuel" and the beginning of 1 Kings (Paulus, *exeg. krit. Abhandl.*, pp. 99–134). Further, it does not mean: the last *prophetic* word in the list of David's prophetical utterances (Grot.), or the last *psalm* (Vatablus: "after he produced all his psalms"), or, his last will and testament, "though he said, did and suffered much afterwards" (Luther); but it is to be understood in the absolute sense: the last of all his words, which he spoke at the end of his life in his theocratic calling and royal consciousness, and in reference to the kingdom of God in Israel, "the last poetical flight that he ever took, perhaps *shortly before his death*, and which was specially noted down for the reason also that it was (from ver. 2) regarded as *the utterance of a seer* (נְאֻם, Num. xxiv. 3, 4, 15, 16)" (Thenius).

Divine saying (נְאֻם*) **of David.** The word always signifies a saying or oracular utterance based on immediate revelation or inspiration. It is the passive participle, = "the thing breathed in, inspired word," and stands here with the Genitive of the human receiver, as in Num. xxiv. 3 sqq. (Balaam) and Prov. xxx. 1 (Solomon),† while it is as a rule followed by "Jehovah" as the author of the inspiration. The following words of David are thereby announced to be a peculiarly prophetic declaration, which rests on an inspeaking of God by His Spirit into his soul. The introduction of the song corresponds in form and content with that of Balaam's prophecy, Num. xxiv. 3. It begins with a simple personal designation, and then designates the qualities of this person that here come into consideration, and may serve to give the reasons for the expression "divine saying" (Hengst.) [As this expression is frequent in the prophetical writings (in Eng. A. V., rendered by "saith the Lord") it is not improbable that the title is from the hand of a later prophetical editor.—Tr.]—**The son of Jesse.** "How humbly he proceeds, boasting not his circumcision, his holiness or his kingdom, not ashamed of his lowly stock, that he was a shepherd; for he will speak of other things that are so high that they need no nobility or holiness, and shall be hurt by no sorrow, neither by sin nor by death" (Luther).

And divine saying of the man who was raised up on high*—the contrast to his lowly origin, as in 2 Sam. vii. 8, "with omission of those above whom he was raised, in order to express absolute superiority" (Hengst.). Tanchum: "Fixed on the plane of loftiness." On this idea see xxii. 44, 48.—Next follows the unfolding of the content of this idea in two members: **the Anointed of the God of Jacob, and the pleasant in the praise-songs of Israel** [the sweet psalmist of Israel]. The first designates his high position not only in the theocratic royal *dignity* conferred on him by God, but also in his royal *dominion* as Anointed of *the Lord* as God's representative and in God's name *over against the people*, and "not merely as an individual, but also as representative of his race" (Hengst.). The second member characterizes David as the *representative towards God of the people in their praise of the Lord for His mighty deeds.* "Pleasant (lovely) in the praise-songs of Israel." The Adjective (נָעִים) does not mean "approved, well-pleasing," as Fries takes it, explaining: "*chosen* to sing Israel's songs of triumph," which is contrary to the constant signification of the word; comp. Ew. § 288 *c*, 291 *a*. Nor is it: "*beloved* [popular] through the songs that Israel sings" (Mich.), or "*kindly* through songs" (Maurer). It is not an ordinary song that it is here named (זָמִיר), but a solemn, joyful song of praise, Job xxxv. 10; Ps. xcv. 2; cxix. 54; Isa. xxiv. 16, and so in Ex. xv. 2 (זִמְרָה) and in the titles of the Psalms (מִזְמוֹר).—As the "Anointed of the Lord" he is equipped with the Holy Spirit from above; as one that is "pleasant in Israel's songs of praise" he likewise shows himself filled with the Lord's Spirit. His high position consists on the one hand in the dignity of his *royal* office as God's representative towards the people, and on the other hand in his *priestly* position, wherein as representative of the people towards God he guides their worship to the height of praise and prayer; and in so far as he is raised to and enabled for both positions by the invoking of

* Const. state of נְאוּם, from נאם, properly—נהם, המה "to boom, murmur, buzz," used of any *dull* tone (kernel of the root *m*), hence especially of secret, confidential impartation (as Germ. *raunen* [Eng. *roun*, whisper]) = *inspirare*, of divine inspiration to prophet or poet as the confidant of God, which is conceived of as whispered into the ear" (Hupf. on Ps. xxxvi. 2 [1], where נאם is used of the inspiration or oracle of wickedness personified as an evil demon).

† [Eng. A. V.: "the man *spake* unto Ithiel." The text is probably corrupt, but there is no mention of Solomon in it.—Tr.]

* עַל absolutely = "*above*," as in Hos. xi. 7 and perhaps vii. 16 (so תַּחַת often = adverb "below," for example Gen. xlix. 25). Sept. wrongly: "whom God [Vat.: the Lord] raised up to be God's anointed" whence Thenius would without ground read: הֵקִים יהוה עַל. Luther, following Vulg. (*cui constitutum est de Christo Dei Jacob*) renders: "who is assured by the Messiah of the God of Jacob." Against the latter (Vulg.) is that there is no Dative sign corresponding to the *cui*. Against the former (Sept.) is that עַל is not = לְ [as introducing what a thing is made to be]; in the passages cited by Then. (Lev. iv. 35; v. 12, comp. vii. 5) עַל denotes either "being conformed to" or "coming in addition to" the other free-offerings.—D. Kimchi and Böttcher arbitrarily make עַל = עֶלְיוֹן "whom the Above [= Most High] has raised up." On the form הֻקַּם, *u* with doubling, see Ew. § 131 *d*.

the divine Spirit, he is also a *prophetical* king and singer of his people, and his word is now spoken as a "divine word."

In accordance with this it is said in ver. 2: —**The Spirit of the Lord speaks into me, and his word is on my tongue.** These words explain the phrase "divine saying" above. and declare that what follows is given him by God's Spirit. The old Rabbis and Crusius (as above, p. 221), connect ver. 2 closely with the preceding, and suppose that David meant herewith to establish the theopneustic authenticity of his *psalms*, and dying, to put his seal, as it were, on them. The verbs must then be taken as real preterites [*spake*, *said*, as in Eng. A. V.], ver. 2 must be understood of all David's songs and prophecies, and ver. 3 specially of the individual prophecy concerning his seed, which was fulfilled in Christ (*sanctio nativitatis* Christi *e progenie Davidis*). That is: "the Spirit of the Lord has always spoken through me, His word has always been on my tongue in all my lays and songs, and especially the God of Israel has spoken through me the prophecy of the future Messiah." But against this Fries (as above, p. 652) properly remarks, that it would distort the relations to reckon in this especial way, among all David's direct and indirect prophecies, precisely that one that was in fact given not through him, but through Nathan. The very definite expression of the second member: "and his word on my tongue," does not permit such a general reference, and is besides to be taken on Present time. Then also the parallel verb in the first member is better taken as Present (*speaks*), and vers. 2, 3 a are the announcement of what follows as the content of the divine inspiration from ver. 3 b on. "The Spirit of Jehovah spake," not "*through* me," which would require the Participle rather than the Perf. (Hengst.), nor "*in me*," against which is the meaning of the phrase elsewhere, but "*into me*," as in Hos. i. 2. Thereby the *origin* of the following declaration is affirmed to be *divine inspeaking*. [The reading "through (by) me" as in Eng. A. V., is allowable, and corresponds very well with the second member.—Tr.]. On the other hand: the "his word is on my tongue" refers to the *human expression* of this divinely given word. While in ver. 1 the *prophetic organ* of the divine saying is doubly characterized, ver. 2 sets forth in two-fold expression the *twofold divine medium* of the inspired prophetic word: the *Spirit* and the *word* of God.

The first half of ver. 3: **Says the God of Israel, to me speaks the Rock of Israel** is identical in form with ver. 2, and expresses in two members the same thought, with special emphasizing of the relation of God (who speaks through David's mouth) to His *people*, and particularly of His rock-like *faithfulness* towards them as the *foundation of all manifestations of salvation*. There is therefore no tautology here. "Says the God *of Israel*," the God that has chosen Israel as His possession, giving them the promises of salvation, whose fulfilment the following revelation announces. "*To me speaks the Rock of Israel*," the God that fulfils His promises according to His *faithfulness* and *unchangeableness* (xxii. 3, 32, 47). The Present rendering is preferable here also. But if the Past be taken: "spake the Rock of Israel," what is here said in ver. 3 a cannot belong to the content of the "divine saying" (ver. 1), "since then David would have derived a very simple, psychologically easily explicable recapitulation of former revelations from present inspiration, and have introduced it with a disproportionate outlay of solemn words" (Fries); rather the Past form is explained by the fact that the act of divine inspeaking preceded the outspeaking of the divine word. The object of the verbs (*says, speaks*), is not a number of prophecies relating to blessed rule, that were received before by David (Tanchum), or (as Thenius thinks probable) the declaration of a prophet, who uttered vers. 3 b, 4 (here recalled by David) at the beginning of David's reign (this thought would have been necessarily otherwise expressed), but the now following declaration. What God *now*, at the moment of His speaking, immediately imparts to him, is declared in what follows: The "*to me*" stands emphatically first ("to me speaks the rock of Israel"), because David has in view his theocratic relation to the following divine word and its relation to him, and because it will be fulfilled in his seed; he expresses his consciousness (which was connected with his prophetic endowment) of the *soteriological significance of his person* for the people in respect to the future fulfillment of the glorious promises given to his seed.—The four members in vers. 2, 3 a stand in chiasmic relation to one another; the first member of ver. 3 a corresponds to the second of ver. 2, and the second of ver. 3 a to the first of ver. 2.

Vers. 3 b, 4. *First part* of the divine saying. The thoroughly abrupt, lapidary style corresponds with the solemn announcement of the imparted divine declaration, and with the fact (thereby declared) that the poet is filled with the divine Spirit and word; the words are inspired exclamations, whose pregnant and enigmatic curtness, heightened by the omission of verbs, is in keeping with the condition of the writer's soul, overpowered by the mighty impulse of the prophetic Spirit, and the immediate view of truth produced by it. Comp. Tholuck, as above, p. 58. **A ruler over men just, a ruler in the fear of God.** These words are not to be taken as apposition to the "God of Israel" in vers. 3 a (Vulg., Luth.), nor as object of the verb "*say*" taken as = "promised" (Maurer: God promised a ruler), or as opposition to "me" ["me a just ruler"], that is, as David's praise *of himself* (Sachs). Nor with Trendelenberg (in Thenius) are we to read "derision" (מָשָׁל "proverb, byword") instead of "ruler," and render: "a byword the righteous may be among men, a byword the fear of God, *but* as morning-light, *etc.*" Further, the words are not to be understood as an affirmation concerning a pious king: "if among men one rules righteously—he is as morning-light, *etc.*" (Cler., Herder, De W., Ew., Then., Baur), as if they expressed for a parenetic end the ethical-religious significance and mission of the Israelitish royal office in general. Such laudation of the governmental virtues of a king would accord neither with the preceding solemn announcement of a *divine oracle*, nor the thence naturally to be expected *weighty content* of the divine saying, would indeed make the *prophetic*

character give way to the didactic. To the view that *any pious and righteous king* is here meant, by the portraiture of whom David wished to convey an exhortation to his sons, is opposed also the *content* of the individual statements that follow, picturing a royal form far above the proportions of an ordinary regent, and especially the reference in ver. 5 to 2 Sam. vii. as giving the *ground* of the picture. The "ruler" here spoken of stands to David's prophetic gaze, in the light of the divine word spoken into him, as the ideal royal form proceeding from his seed, wherein he sees fully realized the idea of a theocratic king according to his religious-moral qualities, and the wielder of a dominion that stretches over all humanity. This last is expressed in the phrase "over* men." The "men" are not, however, the people of Israel, for the expression would then be surprisingly weak and flat, nor are they men as subjects in general and necessary appendage to "any ruler" (Then.), which would be a meaningless pleonasm, but "men" in the absolute sense, humanity, the human race (Fries, as above, p. 656 sq.). If David already sees *himself* made head and ruler of "the nations," his royal dominion extended wide over "the strangers," and praises the Lord's name before the *heathen*, so that they acknowledge him and give him the honor (xxii. 44, 45, 48, 50), here his prophetic glance takes in *all* the nations of the *earth* as embraced in the kingdom of God, wherein the portrayed ruler of the future will bear his universal sway. Comp. Ps. lxxii. 8-17.—This ruler is *just*, perfectly conformed to the holy will of God, compare Psalm lxxii. 1 sq.; Jer. xxiii. 5; xxxiii. 15; Zech. ix. 9.—*A ruler in the fear of God.* His *moral* integrity combined with *religious* perfectness; the "fear of God" is not merely the attribute of the Messianic king, but will be seen completely to fill and control him. Compare Isa. xi. 2, 3. "A ruler of the fear of God, that is, a ruler that will be, as it were, the fear of God itself, the bodily fear of God" (Hengst.). [When we compare this song with Pss. xlv., lxxii., Isa. xi., and similar passages, it seems correcter to regard it as the picture of the ideal theocratic king, than as a vision of a future king. This ideal king is, in the view of the pious Israelite, invested with all conceivable moral and governmental grandeur, and the picture finds its perfect realization only in Jesus of Bethlehem. The "men," however, can hardly be said here to mean "all humanity," but the expression must be taken in the general sense: "a human ruler."—Tr.]

Ver. 4. Picture of the *blessings* that follow the appearance of the future ruler, under the figure of the wholesome effects of the light of the rising sun on a bright morning. **And as morning-light, when the sun rises, morning without clouds, from brightness, from rain grass out of the earth** (sprouts). These words are not to be connected with the following ver. 5, protasis to it as apodosis [as morning-light, *etc.*, is not my house so?] (Dathe); against this is the "for" at the beginning of ver. 5. Nor are they to be connected syntactically with ver. 3—either by adding the first clause of ver. 4 to complete the preceding sentence: "he is as the light of the morning" (De Wette, Thenius, Sept., which reads: "and in the morning-light of God")—or by regarding the whole statement about the morning-light as the continuation of the description of the "ruler" in ver. 3 (the Rabbis, Maurer: "and He will come forth as the morning-light shines," *etc.*). Against this connection is both the form of ver. 3 *b*, which is a sharply defined, isolated exclamation, and the form of ver. 4, "which sensibly enough deviates from the sharply-cut, monumental style of the six words compressed in ver. 3 *b* by a peculiar fulness of lingering description" (Fries, as above, p. 663). Besides, it is only by isolating ver. 4 on both sides that we can find the ground of its content in ver. 5 (which is introduced by "for"), since the statements of ver. 5 agree only with the content of ver. 4, standing in *factual* [or *real*] connection therewith, while ver. 3 *b* presents the ideal of a *person*.—Ver. 4 has the same abrupt, enigmatical, exclamatory tone as ver. 3 *b*, though it differs from it in its particular statements, a natural result of the fact that here a comparison taken from nature is carried out. As in ver. 3 *b*, there is not a single verb, and the different statements are unconnected. Even from this *formal* similarity, ver. 4 is to be regarded as continuation of the immediate divine saying in ver. 3; and not less from its *content*, which is closely connected with that of ver. 3, describing under the figure of natural light the effect of the light that proceeds from the ruler portrayed in ver. 3, and in similar lapidary style. Fries, however (pp. 663, 665), separates ver. 4 from the preceding, holding that the "divine saying" ends in the latter, and that in the former (ver. 4) follows a vision to the ravished eye of the dying David, while at the same time his opened ear heard the revealing word of God; accordingly he translates: "God speaks ——: and before me it is as morning-light in sunshine." But against this view is 1) that the "divine saying" (confined to ver. 3 *b*) would be singularly short in comparison with the elaborate announcement [vers. 1–3 *a*]; 2) that if David here consciously began to describe a *vision* (different from the *divine saying* above), he would have somehow intimated the fact, instead of proceeding with "and as the morning-light;" and 3) that the explanation: "*before me* it is light," *etc.*, introduces into the text what is not intimated in it, for there is no hint here of any special *vision* given to David along with the immediate *word* of God divinely imparted to him. The appearance of the bright glory of a clear life-awakening morning does not now for the first time dawn on the singer, but he sees it from the same height of prophetic contemplation whence he saw the ruler in ver. 3 *b*. He sees both together, and certifies both by the "divine saying," which extends over ver. 4; on both sections of this divine saying, ver. 3 *b* and ver. 4, is stamped the same plastic objectivity of prophetic view, as it is produced by the Spirit of prophecy.

The subject is not the Messiah, as was held by several early expositors (for ex., Crusius [and so Wordsworth now]), who took "the sun rises" as principal sentence, and "sun" as figure of the Messiah (after Mal. iii. 20): "as the morning-

* מֹשֵׁל בָּאָדָם "to rule *over* men," as Gen. iii. 16; iv. 7, not: "among men."

light will the sun rise;" this is forbidden by the collocation of words, and by the fact that this comparison would involve a tautology. It is rather an impersonal expression, the subject being left undetermined: "And *it is* as morning-light, when the sun rises," or, its appearance is as morning-light. The "light of morning" stands in contrast with the darkness of the preceding night, and denotes (as the figure of light generally does) the *well-being* that comes with the ruler after wretchedness and ruin. Comp. Ps. lix. 17 [16]. The "when the sun rises," defining the "morning-light," indicates its source, and answers to the "ruler over men." The "without clouds," parallel to the preceding, strengthens the conception of the well-being as wholly unalloyed. In the "brightness" [Eng. A. V.: clear shining] of the risen sun its light unfolds itself and shows itself active. The "rain" stands in connection with the "without clouds;" after the rain of the night the clouds have dispersed; but from rain and sunshine now sprouts forth the verdure. The expression may be rendered either: "from brightness, from rain comes herb," where "brightness" and "rain" are both causes, or: "from brightness after rain." The former rendering is favored by the immediate repetition of the same Preposition. The fact involved [which is the same, whichever rendering be taken] is the morning sunshine, following the night-rain, dispersing the rain-clouds, and making the fresh herb sprout vigorously from the moist soil. On *rain* as a figure of blessing see Isa. xliv. 3. The *verdure* sets forth the blessings that are the fruit of dispensations from above. Comp. Isa. xliv. 4; xlv. 8; especially Ps. lxxii. 6: "He will come down as rain on the mown field, as showers that water the earth."—"Here," says Thenius rightly, "ends the divine saying," only there is described therein not "the happy work of a ruler, as he ought to be" (Then.), but in general the blessing brought by the definite ideal ruler of the future seen by divine revelation.—The whole figure carries out the thought that the ruler described in ver. 3 will bring weal and blessing in his train.

Ver. 5 gives the *ground* for the divine revelation in vers. 3, 4, by reference to the promise in chap. vii., which forms the foundation of this prophetic view. The introductory conjunction = simply "for," not: "is it *that* my house?" (as if = הֲכִי, Crus., Dathe). The first member is not to be taken as an *affirmation:* "for *not so* is my house" [so nearly Eng. A. V.]. Several Rabbis so understood it, putting an artificial and foreign sense into the words: thus in the preceding verse they take the "morning without clouds" as = "not a cloudy morning,"* and the "from shining after rain," *etc.*, as defining this "cloudy morning," when sunshine after rain produces mildew (Isaaki), or only fleeting light breaks through the clouds (R. Levi), or under the capricious alternation of sunshine and rain "nothing better springs up than quickly withering grass" (D. Kimchi), that they may find in *contrast* therewith the glory of the Davidic House set forth in ver. 5 (comp. Fries, p. 688). So Luther takes the sentence as an *affirmation*, but with the exactly opposite contrast with ver. 4, namely, he regards ver. 5 as an humble confession: "it is not such a house as is worthy of such unspeakable honor from God," that is, such honor as is pictured in ver. 4. "Here David falls into great humility and astonishment that such great things should come from his flesh and blood." In accordance with this he takes the following words: "all my salvation and doing is that nothing grows," that is, "I am also a king and lord, and have well ordered and established the kingdom; *but* such kingdom of mine, yea the realm of all kings on earth, is, in comparison with the dominion of my son Messiah, nothing but a dry branch, that has never grown nor thriven." Against this view is the absence of the subject assumed in it, or, if this subject be found in the "not" taken as = "nothing," the absence of the defining term ("earthly"); nor could David possibly have based the thought that his house would *not* continue on the prophecy in chap. vii. Rather the first member of ver. 5, as well as the third, is to be taken as a *question.**—**For is not my house so with God?** As ver. 3 and ver. 4 are in content inseparably connected, the "*for*" assigns the reason of the whole divine saying, not merely of ver. 4; and the "*so*"† refers to the whole of vers. 3, 4, that is, *so* as is said above of the ruler, the wholesome influence that he brings (light) and its happy effects (verdure). But the *thought* on which this statement is based is not that David says that his own reign was in accord with the truth (vers. 3, 4), that a pious king is like the morning-light, under whose influence every thing prospers—that God has granted blessing to his house and his house's future—that he thence infers that he answers to that figure of a pious ruler, the whole being an instance or example (in the form of a question) attached to the preceding general statement about the "ruler" (De Wette, Then.). For (apart from the fact that this interpretation of vers. 3, 4, as a statement concerning any pious ruler, whose government diffuses blessing, has been above refuted) against this is that the sentence speaks only of David's *house*, not of *himself and his government*, and that, if David had intended to derive an argument respecting himself from the blessing that came to his house, he must have expressed himself quite differently. And Fries rightly remarks that instead of such self-assertory thoughts, it would be seemlier to put into the dying David's mouth a "who am I and what is my house?" (vii. 18).—The sentence is rather to be rendered: "For—stands not my house in such a relation to God?" Hearing and declaring the divine saying (vers. 3, 4), the picture of the ideal theocratic ruler and his attendant blessings, David recalls the promise of imperishable royal dominion that has been given to his house and seed. These two divine declarations he here so combines that the latter

* בֹּקֶר לֹא עָבוֹת in the sense of לֹא בֹּקֶר עָבוֹת.

* לֹא without the Interrog. particle, xix. 23; Deut. xx. 19; Hos. xi. 5; Mal. ii. 15. Ew. § 324 *a*.

† כֵּן is Adverb, — "so," not Adjective — "firmly fixed," *firma* (Fries), or — נָכוֹן, vii. 26; 1 Kings ii. 45, 46 (Crusius).—עִם־אֵל — "with God," not "before God" (De Wette).

(chap. vii.) is made to *confirm* and give the *ground* of the former (vers. 3, 4). The sense is, then, not merely: Stands not my house in such relation to God that out of it shall arise *the righteous ruler?* (Keil), but also that the promised blessings will proceed from him? On the connection between this divine saying (vers. 3, 4) and ver. 5, Fries admirably remarks: "This '*for*' serves as in innumerable cases, to attach a reflection that is meditating an explanation, and we need only put aside the erroneous opinion (that so often makes difficulty in the explanation of Old Testament passages) that sentence on sentence must be taken, as it were, in *one* breath, and grant the speaker a short pause of quiet thought, and we shall then understand the free transition of ideas here between ver. 4 and ver. 5. The quiet transition lies in the successful effort of the soul to gird itself to conscious justification of its belief in the offered blessing." [The connection may be thus indicated: the ruler of men is just and God-fearing, and brings with him all blessings, and this is true of my house, for it is thus in communion with God, for He has made an everlasting covenant with me.—Tr.]—The second "for" gives the reason not merely for the "*so*" (Böttch., Then.), but also for the whole phrase "so is my house with God," since the following sentence involves the position of *his house towards God:* **for He has made with me an everlasting covenant.** These words refer directly to the promise in vii. 12 sq. It is called a *covenant* because of the reciprocal relation between God and the seed of David, as set forth in vers. 12–14. It is according to ver. 16 an *everlasting* covenant: "And sure is thy house and thy kingdom forever before thee, thy throne will be established forever." The phrase "*ordered* (arranged) *in all things*" denotes that the draught of the instrument or deed of covenant is legally correct and exact, is arranged by the declaration of God (Fries). Comp. vii. 14 sqq., where the eventual apostasy of the bearer of the covenant is considered, and in spite of this the maintenance of the covenant is contemplated. The covenant is *preserved*, secured, guarded against non-fulfillment by the truthfulness of the divine promise. Comp. 1 Kin. viii. 25, where Solomon, with reference to 2 Sam. xxiii. 12–16, prays: "*Preserve* to thy servant David, my father, what thou spakest to him."—As these words ("for a covenant, etc.,") thus undoubtedly refer to chap. vii. it is inadmissible with Crusius to refer them to ver. 3 sqq.; for in this latter passage the reciprocity involved in the term "covenant" is altogether lacking, and the predicates, *ordered* and *preserved* are not applicable to it.—The third "*for*" now introduces the interrogatory third member (whose reference to the image in ver. 4: "verdure (sprouts) from the earth" is indubitable), and grounds the writer's confidence in the sureness of the covenant on the future blessings secured by that covenant. **For all my salvation and all pleasure, should He not make it sprout?** *My salvation*, that is, the salvation promised, assured to me and my seed. The *pleasure* must be taken (as the salvation is from *God*) as = what is well-pleasing *to God*, not as = "what is well-pleasing *to me*" (Then., Hengst.); the pronoun "my" is not to be repeated with it [as in Eng. A. V.]. David refers the salvation promised him and his house—not also "the religious and ethical culture of his people" (Then.)—to its source in God's good pleasure, expressed in the covenant as a divine counsel of salvation. "David will say of the divine resolution of salvation that it, because it has once been lodged as a principle in the bosom of the Davidic house by the divine covenant, cannot be accomplished except by thorough development, elaboration of all its elements, conclusory revelation of its deepest secret" (Fries).—"*Should he not* make it sprout?*" The verb is transitive, having "salvation and pleasure" as its object. This corresponds also with the idea of divine causality that controls the whole of ver. 5 and is distinctly expressed in the phrase "*made* a covenant with me" (lit.: established a covenant to me). Fries would find here "the first example and fundamental passage for the solemn use of this verb (צמח "sprout") that occurs afterwards in Isa. iv. 2; xliii. 19; xliv. 4; xlv. 8; lviii. 8; lxi. 11; Jer. xxiii. 5; xxxiii. 15; Zech. iii. 8; vi. 12;" but here the "sprouting" (comp. ver. 4) is affirmed not of the person of the "righteous ruler," but of the salvation and blessing that accompanies him.† [Comp. the parallel statement in Isa. liii. 10, where it is said that the "pleasure" of Jehovah shall prosper in the hand of the righteous servant of Jehovah. Possibly there is a connection between this passage and ours, though the verb employed is different. The general declaration here is, that God in His covenant-mercy will secure all blessing to the writer.—Tr.]

Vers. 6, 7. From the form of the righteous ruler, and in the light of the blessing that proceeds from Him, David sees in prophetic perspective, on the basis of the promise given him, not only the *salvation* and *blessing* of the everlasting covenant under the dominion of the future everlasting king, but also the *judgment* (which will come with Him) *on the ungodly and the enemies of the Messianic theocracy.* **But the wicked—as cast-away thorns are they all.**—The abstract *worthlessness* (for the concrete *worthless*, Deut. xiii. 14) designates the ungodly in their general character, in contrast with the abstract *fear of God* (ver. 3), which forms the religious-moral nature and character of the righteous ruler; as in him only fear of God, so in them only worthlessness. The *thorns* set forth the hurtful and dangerous enemies of God's people and kingdom, Num. xxxiii. 55; Isa. xxvii. 4; Nah. i. 10; Ezek. xxviii. 24. The thorns, con-

* The fourth כִּי resumes the third, the interrogation being continued. It (the כִּי) might have been omitted, but its double use makes equally emphatic the salvation and the sprouting.—יַצְמִיחַ is Hiphil, causative. [Instead of חֵפֶץ כִּי Wellhausen proposes to read חֶפְצִי, which is smoother, but perhaps for that very reason suspicious.—Tr.]

† Sept. separates the כִּי־לֹא יַצְמִיחַ from ver. 5 and inserts it before ver. 6, omitting the וּ: ὅτι ὂυ μὴ βλαστήσῃ ὁ παράνομος. So Michaelis: "the ungodly will not spring forth." Against this is the Hiphil, and the fact that if this last clause were intended to express the thought: "He (God) alone is my salvation, *etc.*," we should at least expect to find the words "for he" (כִּי הוּא).

sidered as representing enemies, are said (literally) to be "hunted, driven away;"* when the thing itself (the thorns) is had in view, this meaning is modified into "put, cast away." The basis of the figure is the field (comp. the "verdure out of the earth," ver. 3), whose yield is obstructed by thorns. The rapid, prophetic glance, not pausing at the details of the process, but hastening to the end, sees the enemy already overpowered, and now tarries by the final act of destruction, which makes the enemy harmless. While the production of blessing under the righteous ruler is represented (by the figure of sprouting, growing) as a *gradual process*, the judgment on the ungodly is set forth as *final judgment* (the burning of the thorns). The thorns are no longer hurtful; they appear to David "already as thorns torn up, with which one may no longer hurt his hands, since all kindness to them has been in vain" (Herder).—**For they are not taken with the hand**, that is, one does not grasp them with naked, unarmed hand in order to throw them into a heap for burning, but he that touches them for this purpose, provides,† arms himself with iron and shaft. The poetical discourse names the various parts of the implement with which the thorns are seized and thrown into a heap (not: "torn out of the earth," Then.). The expression refers not to the attacking and overcoming of the ungodly, but to their final destruction, set forth by the burning of the thorns, to which this seizing and heaping up is preparatory.—**And with fire are they utterly consumed**; the *fire* is symbol of the divine wrath; the expressions indicate the indubitable certainty and completeness of destruction in this final catastrophe (the same figure in Matt. iii. 10; xiii. 30).—The concluding word (בַּשָּׁבֶת)‡ is to be rendered: "*so that there is an end to them*" [Eng. A. V.: "in the same place"]. Not "at the seat," as euphemistic expression for the place where trash and filth are thrown (Böttcher, Deut. xxiii. 12 sqq.)—why should the thorns be first brought to this place? not: "in the place of dwelling," the place where they grow (Kimchi, Keil), for the term "dwelling" would be here unsuitable, and the thorns are burnt not where they grow, but where they are cast; and so not: "at the seat," = "on the spot," "burnt straightway," because no other use can be made of them than to manure the fields with their ashes (Then. [Eng. A. V.]); not: "at home" (Cler., Buns.), for one does not take the trouble to carry them home, nor: "at length" (Dathe). The word = "*in ceasing*," not, however: "as the *extirpation* is ended" (Thenius formerly), but: "in that they cease;" the burning proceeds so that a complete ceasing, disappearance takes place. "They are there only for burning, and this *end* awaits them, that not even the place where they stood is seen" (Herder). The *complete cessation* or annihilation of the thorns follows naturally on the "burning" as its final result. "This figure also . . . is taken from the promise in vii. 10. Israel is there represented as a vineyard, his family is to be its guardian, and so the rebels are hurtful, unfaithful thorns" (Herder).—The Prep. "*in*" serves to supplement the verbal statement by the substantive-idea, as in Ps. lxv. 6: I have heard thee in or with salvation, that is, so that I gave thee salvation; so here: they are burned in ceasing, so that they cease.

[*Condensed paraphrase* of David's last words: "God said to me: The righteous theocratic king dispenses blessings as the rain and sunshine. God, in His covenant, has assured me salvation; but the ungodly shall be destroyed." The *neum* or oracle is thus first, a description of the ideal theocratic king, and then the expression of the writer's personal relation to God, with the implication that godliness is the basis of the divine procedure. This conception of the true theocratic king is realized perfectly only in Jesus Christ, and may thus be termed a typical conception, that is, one that was partially realized for the contemporaries, and destined hereafter to be completely realized.—The versions here are not very useful; the Chaldee paraphrases throughout, and interprets the passage directly of the Messiah, the text of the Sept. differs from that of the Heb., but Vulg. and Syr. conform in general in text and rendering to the masoretic text.—Tr.]

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The prophetic element, which appears in David's Messianic Psalms, comes out most strongly here. In Nathan's promise and prophecy in vii. 12 sq. David is merely passively receptive, and his prayer (ver. 18 sq.) is only the echo of the divine word he has received; but here he rises to highest prophetic action, which presupposes indeed a passive bearing towards the divine saying (the *Neum*) by which he receives an *immediate* revelation in plastic form of what he had previously received as a promise *through* Nathan, and this revelation he announces in a prophetic discourse, which in form and content answers to the complete possession of his soul by the power of the divine Spirit. The theocratic *king* is here also the theocratic *prophet*, applying to himself as God-inspired singer epithets that are suitable only for prophecy (ver. 1 sq.), and then, on the *historical* ground of his kingship and its blessings, and on the *revelation*-ground of the word of God that came directly to him, *prophesying the antitype of his kingdom in the appearance of the royal glory and saving work of the righteous ruler of the future*. It is clear from the preceding exposition that this picture transcends the form of an ordinary pious king and his blessings; and strict exegesis also shows that David here looks wholly away from himself to a royal personage in the far future.

* כֻּנָּד not Pass. of הֵנִיד "*shaken* (in order to remove)" (Böttch.) but Hoph. Part. of נוּד or נָדַד.—כֻּלָּהֵם for כֻּלָּם. The ־ָהֵם for ־ָם (cont. ־ָם) is infrequent archaic form of 3 masc. Ges. § 91, Rem. 2.

† On יִמָּלֵא [lit.: fill the hand] comp. 2 Kings ix. 24, and on the "arms" 1 Sam. xvii. 7.

‡ שֶׁבֶת is Subst. from שָׁבַת "to cease" (Prov. xx. 3); it may also be pointed as Infin., בְּשֶׁבֶת. For the verb see Gen. viii. 22; Isa. xxiv. 18; xiv. 4; Lam. v. 15; Prov. xxii. 10; Josh. v. 12. [The word is possibly not part of the true text. It occurs again in the next line, and in both places Sept. reads בֹּשֶׁת, αἰσχύνη, "shame" (see on ver. 8); it may have gotten into our verse from the following (Wellh.). Vulg.: *usque ad nihilum*; Syr.: "for cessation."—Tr.]

2. The *content* of the prophecy is the picture of a *future* ruler perfect in *righteousness* and the *fear of God*. He is *accompanied* by the *light of salvation*, which has dissipated the darkness, and diffuses itself in purest radiance like morning-light at sunrise. The *effect* of this light-appearance is the manifestation of gracious blessings, set forth under the image of verdure springing from the earth. But with the *blessing* of the future ruler's *peaceful* work is completed also the revelation of *judgment* (presupposing victorious *conflict*), whereby the righteous ruler puts an end to all the enmity of godlessness and to all opposition to his rule.

3. From the height of prophetic view and in the line of prophetic perspective David's look rests on the ideal of a glorious royal *person*, raised high above all earthly royal forms in Israel (his *antitype* in the historical person of Christ), in whom *righteousness* and *piety* appear absolute and complete, and whose *dominion* in truth extends *over all men*. Comp. Ps. lxxii. The fulness of *salvation and blessing*, which is to appear with the prophesied king, is the object of the Messianic hope and expectation through all the periods of Israel's history, but does not appear as here portrayed, in historical reality till the coming of Christ. The *final judgment* (following the appearance of the righteous ruler) that annihilates all ungodliness, is completed only under the rule of Him to whom all judgment has been committed by the Father, and in the final decision to which the opposition between the kingdoms of light and darkness is pressing on.

4. The *historical* presupposition of the prophecy is the promise in chap. vii.; here for the first time is shown how, on the basis of this promise, the view [*anschauung*, intuition, conception] of the Davidic kingdom becomes clear. "In that the song gives the image of a righteous ruler with a glorious future, adding that such a government is signified by the everlasting covenant that God made with the house of David, we see clearly here already how the knowledge of the *idea* advances to individualization in the *ideal*, and so (to use Sack's expression) *typical prophecy* [*bildweissagung*] arises. Doubtless epithets may be applied to any king that sits on David's throne, that are true not of himself, but of the dynasty he represents (comp. such passages as Ps. xxi. 5, 7 [4, 6]; lxi. 7 [6]). But, impelled by the Spirit, the sacred poetry produces a royal form that transcends all that the present shows, and exhibits the Davidic-Solomonic kingdom in ideal perfectness" (Œhler, in *Herz.* IX., 412, Art. *Messias*).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

A *blessed end*, when in *looking back* upon the path of life that lies behind, and the manifestations of God's grace that have been made to him, one has nothing to utter but gratitude and praise —when in *looking around* upon his own life's acquisitions and his possession of salvation, all self-glorying is silent, and only the testimony to God's grace and mercy, that has done all and given all, comes upon the lips—when in *looking forward* into the future of God's kingdom upon earth, on the ground of the grace experienced in life one's faith becomes a prophet, beholding the ways along which the Lord will lead His kingdom through darkness to light, through conflict to victory, and by such a proclamation of the coming glory strengthening the hearts of many and confirming them in the hope of the Lord's gracious help to the end, which never suffers His people to be put to shame—and when in *looking up* to the everlasting hills from which all help has come,* the "last word" upon earth is a loud Hallelujah, that sounds across into eternity.—The humbler the heart is, the more highly does it praise the gracious gifts and guidance of the Lord; the more a man feels himself little and poor in the sight of the great and gracious God, so much the greater and more glorious will that appear to him which without desert on his part God has given him, in bodily good and spiritual gifts, so much the more joyfully will he, under the guidance and impulse of the Holy Spirit, regard all that flesh and blood might boast of, as coming from the foundation of divine grace.—A servant of God should (every one) show himself, who like David is called to service in God's kingdom; every one's place is in God's sight high and glorious, however lowly and mean it may be in men's eyes, and in his place he should 1) as an "anointed of the Lord" perform the duties of his *kingly* office, and with his God and Lord conquer and rule the world, 2) as a *priest* of the Lord proclaim His praise in word and deed, and to the Lord's honor make the harp of his heart sound out into the world, and 3) as a *prophet* of the Lord prophesy of the glory of the Lord and of His kingdom, the Spirit of God and not his own spirit speaking through him, the word of God and not his own word sounding from his lips.

True preaching is always a prophetic testimony, 1) as to its *origin:* the Spirit of the Lord speaks through it, 2) as to its *content:* the word of the Lord is upon its tongue, and 3) as to its *subject:* the mysteries of God's saving purpose, which only God's Spirit can explain; the great deeds of God's grace, which can be proclaimed only on the ground of personal inner experience and of one's own seeing and hearing; and the future affairs of God's kingdom, in the manifestations of divine salvation and divine judgment, which only the eye illuminated by the light of the Spirit can behold. —When the Lord speaks through His Spirit and in His word, then should man's own thoughts bow and be silent, but then also should the human spirit and the human word be the instruments of God's Spirit and God's word.—The *prophetic photograph* of the future *ruler* in the *prophecy* of David answers in its outlines to the counterpart of the *fulfillment* in Christ, and this 1) in respect to his *personal appearing*, perfect righteousness and holiness in complete fear of God (religious-ethical perfection); 2) in respect to the *extent* of his royal dominion—he is ruler "over men," universality of world-dominion; 3) in respect to the *foundations* of his kingdom, the *promises* of God; 4) in respect to the *activity* and *effects* of his royal rule on the one hand in the enlightening, warming, animating and fructifying *light* of his manifestations of grace and blessings

* [Ps. cxxi. 1, 2, of which, however, the proper translation is: "I lift up my eyes to the mountains. Whence cometh my help? My help is from Jahveh the Maker of heaven and earth."—Tr.]

of salvation, on the other hand in the *fire* of His judgment, consuming all ungodliness.

The morning-light of divine grace and truth in Christ, 1) *Breaking* in the dawn of the promises and predictions of the Old Testament; 2) *Flashing up* out of the night that before covered the world, and frightening away its darkness and its clouds; 3) *Appearing* in the *Sun* of righteousness and salvation; 4) *Bringing* salvation and blessing, dispensed from on high to all men—and a new life, fruitful for the kingdom of God, which springs from below out of the earth.—The *rain in the night* is the image of the *blessing* coming from above, which has been hidden in the trouble brought by the night, and not merely becomes manifest when the night is gone, but also in the shining of divine grace and truth dispenses the fructifying life-force, from which springs new health and new life.—"Morning-light—sunrise—morning without clouds—shining after rain—grass out of the earth—then—then—then," this is the *gradation* in which faith beholds the process of *appearing* of salvation and life from above, and the *effects* of salvation beneath—this is the surpassing fullness of salvation, in presence of which our human speech, unable adequately to express the unspeakable, can only speak and testify in such a lapidary style.

LUTHER: Here David comes forth and boasts high above all bounds, yet with truth, without any arrogance!—Here David is another man than Jesse's son. This he did not inherit from his birth, nor learn from his father, nor gain by his kingly power or wisdom. From above it is given him, without any desert on his part; in this he is joyous, praises and gives thanks so heartily.—Faith is and also should be a fortress of the heart, which does not shake, totter, quake, writhe nor doubt, but stands fast and is sure of its point.—Faith is not quiet and silent; it comes forth, speaks and preaches of such promises and grace of God, that also others come to them and partake of them.—SCHLIER: In the first place we see the natural ground and soil in which the prophecy grows, namely the person of David, who out of a shepherd's son has become the anointed of the Lord. If no prediction attaches itself to this historical ground, it is to be feared that it is no true prophetic word. But the main matter now first comes, namely, the Spirit of the Lord, that the prophet does not bring his own thoughts but God's thoughts, and that he does not speak what has pleased himself, but what God has put into him.—LUTHER: David means not only the loveliness and sweetness of the psalms, as to grammar and music, in that the words are ornamentally and skillfully arranged and the song sounds sweet—but much rather as to Theology, as to the spiritual understanding, therein are the Psalms very lovely and sweet; for they are consoling to all troubled and distressed consciences, which are involved in sin's anguish and deadly torture and fear, and all sorts of need and sorrow.—[TAYLOR: David spoke, and the human style had all the characteristics of his usual productions; for the Spirit and not the vocal organs of the prophet alone, but his intellectual and emotional powers as well. But God spoke by David, and that which he uttered was the truth, infallible as He who gave it.—TR.]

Ver. 2. LUTHER: What a glorious, noble pride it is; he who can boast that the Spirit of the Lord speaks through him, and his tongue speaks the Holy Spirit's word, must indeed be sure of what he says. Such boasting may still be made by every one of us that is not a prophet.—This may we do, inasmuch as we also are holy and have the Holy Spirit, so that we boast ourselves catechumens and disciples of the prophets, who say after them and preach what we have heard and learned from the prophets and apostles, and are also certain that the prophets have taught it.—Ver. 3. SCHLIER: So profess all the prophets of themselves, so professes all Scripture from beginning to end, and God be thanked that we have before us such a revelation of God, wherein God unveils Himself to us and draws near in the Holy Spirit.—STARKE: The chief aim, the star and heart of Holy Scripture is Christ. Luke xxii. 44; John v. 39. Christ, while a true high-priest and prophet, is also a true king. Luke i. 32, 33.—LUTHER: They fall into Jewish blindness who make *David* such a righteous ruler and ruler in the fear of God, and pervert the promise into a command and law, to the effect that whoever wishes to rule over men should be righteous and God-fearing, while David so devoutly and heartily boasts that they are words of promise of the Messiah of the God of Jacob, and not a command to secular lords. [This represents an extreme view of the present and many similar passages which some still entertain. The language is completely fulfilled only in Messiah, but had its suggestion and basis in what was true of David, and what every good ruler ought to strive to reproduce in himself. So above, in additions of Tr. to "Exegetical." TAYLOR: David describes the character of a ruler: and reduplicating on that description, he in effect says (ver. 5), "Is it not to be the distinctive feature of my lineage that it shall rule in justice, and in the fear of the Lord?"—a feature which came out not only in Solomon, but also in Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah and others, and especially and pre-eminently in Jesus Christ, in whom this prophecy culminated, and by whom it was thoroughly fulfilled.—TR.]

Ver. 4. SCHLIER: Is not the Lord really our sun, which after a long movement at last rises upon us and with the splendor of His light makes all bright and clear and warm, and now under the blessing of His beam all begins to be green and blooming; everything grows and prospers, at least whatever does not shut itself against the Lord, but opens itself to Him and repels not His sunny beams?—The Lord brings blessing and prosperity, and in Him there is nothing lacking, if only we would like to receive such a blessing which is present for us.—LUTHER: Like the spring, so is also the rule and reign of grace a joyous, lusty time, wherein Messiah makes us righteous and God-fearing, so that we become green, blooming, fragrant, and grow and become fruitful. For He is the sun of righteousness, who draws near to us. Mal. iv. 2.—And now go so: Who lives in spring, he dies no more; who dies in winter, he lives no more;—for the sun goes away from the latter; but to the former the sun rises up of which David prophesies. Where the sun, Christ, does not shine clear, the spring also is not pleasant; but Moses with the law's thunder makes

everything dreadful and quite deadly. But here, in Messiah's times (says David), when He shall reign over Israel itself, with grace to make us righteous and save us, it will be as delightful as the best time in spring, when before day there has been a delightful warm rain, that is, the consoling gospel has been preached, and quickly thereupon the sun Christ comes up in our heart through right faith without Moses' clouds and thunder and lightning. Then all proceeds to grow, to be green and blooming, and the day is rich in joy and peace.

Ver. 5. CRAMER: God's covenant is an everlasting covenant, and remains also when the world passes away.—S. SCHMID: In Christ alone our salvation blooms; He alone can quiet all our longing. Acts iv. 12.—LUTHER: Of the everlasting covenant and house of David the two words "ordered" and "sure" are designedly used to instruct and console. For if you look at the histories, it will seem to you that God has forgotten His covenant and not kept it sure;—after Messiah His kingdom the Church is, when outwardly looked at, much more waste and disorderly, so that there is no more distracted, wretched, good-for-nothing government or dominion than the Christian Church, Christ's dominion. Here the tyrants distract and waste it with all their might. Here the fanatics and heresies root up and spoil it. So also the false Christs with their evil life make it as if there were no more shameful, disorderly government upon earth. And these are working, or rather the evil spirit through them, to the end that Christ's dominion shall not exist, or at any rate shall be a wretchedly disorderly thing. And in fine Christ acts as if He had forgotten His dominion and was never at home, so that here neither "ordered" nor "sure" is seen by the reason. Though we do not see it, He sees it who says, Song of Sol. viii. 12: My vineyard is before me; Matt. xxviii. 20, Lo, I am with you even to the end of the world; John xvi. 23, Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world. However, we see that there has always remained and still remains a people which honors the name of Christ, and has His word, baptism, sacrament, key and Spirit, even against all the gates of hell.

Vers. 6, 7. S. SCHMID: He who seizes thistles with the naked hand acts imprudently; but yet more imprudent is he who holds close friendship with the children of Belial. 2 Cor. vi. 7.—SCHLIER: Where Christ the Lord counts for something there is blessing and prosperity; but where He is despised there are thorns and thistles.—A man's true worth is determined by his attitude towards Christ.—Every tree that brings not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.—He who cares for Christ is also cared for in the sight of God. But he who despises Christ amounts to nothing, and is counted in the sight of God as mere thorns and thistles.

[Ver. 5. *The covenant with David.* I. Its contents: 1) His seed should reign forever, vii. 12–16. 2) Should reign in justice and the fear of God (ver. 3). 3) Should bring great prosperity to His subjects (ver. 4), like morning light dispelling the darkness, like morning showers causing the grass to spring up. 4) Should utterly destroy his enemies (vers. 6, 7). II. Its character—everlasting, well-ordered, sure.—TR.]

FIFTH SECTION.

David's Heroes.

CHAPTER XXIII. 8–39.

8 These *be* [are] the names of the mighty men whom David had: The Tachmon-
ite that sat in the seat [*margin*, Josheb-bassheheth the Tachmonite], chief among
the captains [*margin*, head of the three], the same was Adino the Eznite [*om.* the
same was A. the E.]; *he lift up his spear* [*write without italics*] against eight hun-
9 dred whom he slew [slain] at one time. And after him was Eleazar the son of
Dodo the Ahohite, one of the three mighty men with David, when they defied the
Philistines *that* were there gathered together [*probably:* he was with David at Pas-
dammim, and the P. were there assembled] to battle, and the men of Israel were
10 gone away [went up]. He arose and smote the Philistines until his hand was
weary, and his hand clave unto the sword; and the Lord [Jehovah] wrought a
great victory [deliverance] that day, and the people returned after him only to
11 spoil. And after him was Shammah the son of Agee the Hararite. And the Phi-
listines were gathered together into a troop [*or*, to Lehi], where was [and there was
there] a piece of ground full of lentiles, and the people fled from the Philistines.

12 But [And] he stood in the midst of the ground, and defended [saved] it, and slew
[smote] the Philistines; and the Lord [Jehovah] wrought a great victory [deli-
verance].
13 And three of the thirty chief went down, and came to David in the harvest-time
unto the cave of Adullam; and the troops of the Philistines pitched [encamped] in
14 the valley of Rephaim. And David was then in an hold, and the [a] garrison of
15 the Philistines was then in Bethlehem. And David longed and said, Oh that one
would give me drink of the water of the well of Bethlehem, which is by the gate!
16 And the three mighty men broke through the host of the Philistines, and drew wa-
ter out of the well of Bethlehem, that was by the gate, and took it and brought it
to David; nevertheless [and] he would not drink thereof, but poured it out unto
17 the Lord [Jehovah], And he said [And said], Be it far from me, O Lord [Jehovah
forbid] that I should do this; is *not this* [shall I drink] the blood of the men that
went in jeopardy of their lives? therefore [and] he would not drink it.
These things did these [the] three mighty men.
18 And Abishai, the brother of Joab, the son of Zeruiah, was chief among three
[*better*, chief of the thirty]. And he lifted up his spear against three hundred and
slew *them* [300 slain], and had the [a] name among three [the thirty]. Was he
19 not [He was] most honourable of three [the thirty], therefore he was [and became]
their captain, howbeit [and] he attained not unto the *first* [*om.* first] three.
20 And Benaiah the son of Jehoiada, the son of [*om.* the son of] a valiant man of
Kabzeel, who had done many acts [man, who had done many acts, of Kabzeel], he
slew two lion-like men of Moab. He went down also [And he went down] and
21 slew a [the] lion in the midst of a [the] pit in time [in a day] of snow. And he
slew an Egyptian, a goodly man [*or*, a man of great stature], and the Egyptian
22 had a spear in his hand, but [and] he went down to him with a staff, and plucked
the spear out of the Egyptian's hand, and slew him with his own spear. These
things did Benaiah the son of Jehoiada, and had the [a] name among three mighty
23 men [among the thirty heroes]. He was more honourable than the thirty, but he
attained not to the *first* [*om.* first] three. And David set him over his guard [made
him of his privy council].
24 Asahel the brother of Joab *was* one of the thirty, Elhanan the son of Dodo of
25, 26 Bethlehem, Shammah the Harodite, Elika the Harodite, Helez the Paltite, Ira
the son of Ikkesh the Tekoite, Abiezer the Anethothite, Mebunnai the Hushathite,
27 Zalmon the Ahohite, Maharai the Netophathite, Heleb the son of Baanah a [the]
28 Netophathite, Ittai the son of Ribai, out of Gibeah of the children of Benjamin,
29 Benaiah the Pirathonite, Hiddai of the brooks of Gaash [*or*, of Nahale-Gaash],
30 Abi-albon the Arbathite, Azmaveth the Barhumite, Eliahba the Shaalbonite, *of*
31, the sons of Jashon [*probably*, Hashem the Gizonite], Jonathan, Shammah the
32, 33 Hararite [*or*, Jonathan the son of Shammah (Shage) the Hararite], Ahiam the
34 son of Sharar the Hararite [Ararite], Eliphalet the son of Ahasbai, the son of [*or*,
35 Hepher] the Maachathite, Eliam the son of Ahithophel the Gilonite, Hezrai the
Carmelite, Paarai the Arbite, Igal the son of Nathan of Zobah, Bani the Gadite,
36 Zelek the Ammonite, Nahari the Beerothite, armour-bearer to Joab the son of Ze-
37, 38 ruiah, Ira an [the] Ithrite, Gareb an [the] Ithrite, Uriah the Hittite; thirty
and seven in all.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 8. *Superscription.* **These are the names of the heroes that David had.** In the parallel section 1 *Chron.* xi. 10–41 there are *two superscriptions.* Chap. xi. 10 has: "And these are the heads [chiefs] of the heroes that David had, who stood stoutly by him in his kingdom with all Israel, to make him king." With these words the Chronicler attaches the following *list of heroes* to the account of the choice of David by all the Tribes (vers. 1–3), comp. 2 Sam. v. 1–3, thus giving a reason for inserting the list here. Further the list follows immediately the narrative of the conquest of Zion and the choice of Jerusalem as capital, vers. 4–9 (2 Sam. v. 6–10), especially to illustrate the remark in ver. 9: "and David grew greater and greater" (comp. 2 Sam. v. 10).—Besides the fuller superscription, which assigns the list its *historical position*, the Chronicler has a *second* simpler one, ver. 11 *a:* "And this is the number of the heroes that David had." *The Gibborim* [Heroes, Mighty men], elsewhere given in round numbers at six hundred men, formed a standing central corps, which (just as the body-guard, the Cherethites

and Pelethites) remained near David and at his personal disposal. On the origin and development of this corps comp. 1 Sam. xxii. 2; xxiii. 13; xxv. 13; xxvii. 2; xxx. 9–24; 2 Sam. x. 7; xv. 18; xvi. 16; xx. 7, and Ewald's *Hist. of Israel*, III. 122, 140; 189 sq. [Germ. ed.] The first superscription in Chron.: "these are the *heads* of the heroes" (ver. 10), corresponds exactly with the list, which gives not the "*names*" (2 Sam., ver. 8) nor the "*number*" (1 Chron., ver. 11) of the heroes, but only the chief among them. The list in Chron. gives no number, though the superscription (ver. 11) states this to be the *number* of the heroes, while the list in 2 Sam. xxiii., speaking only of *names* on the superscription, gives at the close the whole number as *thirty-seven*. As in our list only thirty-seven out of six hundred Gibborim are mentioned, we may conjecture (with Then., after Chron.) that the word "heads" has here fallen out after "names" ["the names of the heads of the heroes"]. Otherwise the term Gibborim must be taken in a *narrower* sense (heroes among the heroes) [which is the more probable explanation.—Tr.]. Neither the form nor the content of the list indicates a *division into three classes* (as held by most expositors); there is only a triple gradation in respect to the bravery of the heroes, first, *three* of the first rank (vers. 8–12), then *two*, distinguished for bravery, but "not attaining to the three" (vers. 18–23), and finally *thirty-two*, of whom no deeds are mentioned. The five of the first and second ranks, and seven of the third, altogether *twelve*, were named by David leaders of the *twelve* divisions into which he divided the army, each of which had to do service one month in the year (1 Chron. xxvii. 1–15). In the list in 1 Chron. (xi. 41–47) occur *sixteen* names that are lacking here. In other respects the two lists agree materially, only that in both there is a considerable number of textual errors.

Vers. 8–12. The three greatest heroes, *Jashobeam*, *Eleazar*, *Shammah*, and their deeds.—Ver. 8. Our text has *Josheb-basshebeth*, while Chron., has *Jashobeam;* the latter (according to 1 Chron. xxvii. 2) is the correct reading.* Instead of *Tachmoni* read "the son of Hachmoni" as in Chron.; comp. 1 Chron. xxvii. 32, where it is said: "Jehiel the son of *Hachmoni* was with the sons of the king;" this Jehiel was perhaps a brother of Jashobeam. Comp. also 1 Chron. xxvii. 32, where Jashobeam is called the son of Zabdiel; but this "is no discrepancy, since *Zabdiel* might be the proper name, and *Hachmoni* the patronymic but better known name of the father" (Böttch.).—"Head of the knights (body-guardsmen)." "*Head*" here is not = "leader" (which would be שַׂר according to the usage of our books, comp. ver. 19, Böttch.), but = "chief, most distinguished." "*Shalishim* or riders (knights);" this word (שָׁלִשִׁים)† is to be taken with Thenius as meaning the most distinguished warriors standing nearest the persons of kings and generals; the *name* [lit.: "third man"] it may be conjectured, had its origin in the fact that from these warriors was chosen the man who, when the king or general went to battle, stood with him in the chariot (along with the driver) as *third man*. With this agrees (Then. p. 276) 2 Kin. ix. 25, where Jehu says to *his Shalish:* "Remember how I and thou *rode together after* Ahab;" and so in the pictures at Nineveh (Layard), in which the principal personage, drawing the bow, is covered by the shield of a warrior on his left, while the driver stands in front of the two. According to Ex. xiv. 7 (comp. xv. 4) every chariot was in unusual wise provided with a *shalish* [Eng. A. V. captain]. From Ezek. xxiii. 15, these favored men seem (later, at least) to have been distinguished by a special dress. From these *shalishim* (who afterwards formed a special Corps, near the person of the king, 2 Kin. x. 25) the kings seem to have chosen their adjutants, comp. 2 Kin. vii. 2 (xvii. 19); ix. 25; xv. 25, and in 1 Kin. ix. 22 they appear as a special military rank or office. The term signifies, therefore, not: chariot warriors, three on a chariot, nor: (with a different pointing) the 30 leaders of the 600 Gibborim [Heroes] (Ew., Berth.), nor: *regulars* drawn up "three deep," that is, *superior* soldiers (Böttch.), but: shalish*-corps, shalish-men, lifeguardsmen, "knights" (Luther, in "Kings"). [The meaning of *shalish* is obscure, but here it seems better to adopt the reading "three." Jashobeam was chief or most eminent of the three highest, which agrees best with the context. So margin of Eng. A. V.—Tr.]—The text of the next following words [Eng. A. V.: "the same was A. the E."] is corrupt and unintelligible, and is to be read (after ver. 18 and Chron. ver. 11): "*he brandished his spear*."† Instead of 800 Chron. has 300, taken probably from ver. 18, in order to soften the seemingly monstrous number 800. "At one time" = *in one battle*. "Eight hundred *slain*" (חָלָל), not "warriors," as Kennicott (according to Thenius) renders: "he brandished his spear over 800 warriors, was their leader." The meaning is, either that in one battle he swung his spear till he had killed 800 men (Ew., Berth., Böttch., Keil), or that after the battle he brandished his spear over those that were killed by him and his men, as symbol of victory over them (Thenius). [For various forced interpretations of the verse see citations in Wordsworth and Philippson.—Tr.]

Ver. 9 sqq. **After him**, next him in the list, **was Eleazar . . . with David**; comp. ver. 11. "The son of *Dodai*," as the text reads (pointed according to 1 Chron. xxvii. 4). The margin has *Dodo*, 1 Chron. xi. 12 [so Eng. A. V. here]. "The son of an Ahohite," in Chron.

---

* According to Kennicott the two last letters of ישבעם stood in a MS. under the בשבת of the preceding line (ver. 7), and a transcriber by mistake attached the latter word instead of עם to ישב. [Or, it may be that the בשבת here is corruption of עסבן in Chron., and passed from ver. 8 into ver. 7. Sept. 'Ιεβοσθέ = אִשְׁבֹּשֶׁת for אִשְׁבַּעַל (Wellh.). See on בשבת ver. 7.—Tr.]

† So read here and in Chron. instead of our text; so in vers. 13, 23, 24, and 1 Chron. xi. 15, 42; xii. 4; xxvii 6 (instead of שְׁלוֹשִׁים). [Or, perhaps better here שְׁלֹשָׁה.—Tr.]

* In שָׁלִישִׁי the ִי is Adj. ending (as in כְּרֵתִי and פְּלֵתִי), denoting *rank*. Ew. § 177 *a*, § 164.

† [Some hold that עדינו is corruption of עוֹרֵר, and that עצן = "spear" (comp. Arab. ערן and עסן), but this last is altogether uncertain.—Tr.]

"the Ahohite." "Among the three heroes,"* that is, the renowned trio, Jashobeam, Eleazar and Shammah (ver. 11).—Instead of our text† read with Chron.: "with David (Chron.: *he was* with David) at Pas-dammim, and the Philistines, *etc.*" *Pas-dammim* is probably the same place with "Ephes-dammim," 1 Sam. xvii. 1.—**And the Philistines had there assembled to battle.** The words from "and the men of Israel went up" (ver. 9) to "and the Philistines were gathered together to Lehi [Eng. A. V.: into a troop]" (ver. 11) have fallen out of the text of Chron.,‡ so that the name of the third hero Shammah" is there wanting, as his deed (vers. 11, 12) falls to Eleazar.—The verb "went up" [Eng. A. V. wrongly: were gone away] denotes simply the marching of the men of Israel against the Philistines; it is unnecessary to add: "in flight" (Then.). The *flight* or holding back of the Israelites (involved in the "and the people returned," ver. 10), inasmuch as it occurred after the advance to battle (wherefore Eleazar undertook the contest with the Philistines alone), is not expressly mentioned in the concise narrative, but is first indicated by the "*returned.*" If the word "went up" had been intended to indicate "flight to *higher* positions earlier occupied" (Then.), then necessarily a corresponding additional statement would have been made, such as Böttcher too boldly conjectures: "they went up on the mountain and lost heart." A correct explanation of the "returned" is given by Josephus [*Ant.* 7, 12, 4]: "when the Israelites fled, he alone remained," and by the Vulgate, in its addition in ver. 10: "and the people, who had fled, returned." [There is not necessarily any hint in the text that the people had fled; the "returned" might refer to the withdrawal from pursuit of the defeated enemy. *Bib.-Com.*, suggests that this view (as in Eng. A. V.: "gone away") may have arisen from the misapplication in 1 Chron. xi. 13 of the phrase "the people fled" to this battle, whereas it belongs to Shammah's exploit.—Tr.]—Ver. 10. **He arose,** that is, when the others had fallen back. Josephus: "he alone remained." **And smote the Philistines till his hand clave to the sword,** his hand was cramped around the sword-hilt by weariness. "Jehovah wrought *great deliverance,*" that is, a great victory [observe the theocratic form of the Heb. expression: a victory is a *deliverance* or *salvation* from God.—Tr]. **And the people returned after him.*** After this exploit the people had nothing to do but to follow for the purpose of plundering, to strip the slain (Sept.).

Ver. 11 sqq. The third principal hero, *Shammah.* Another of this name (not to mention the incorrect reading in ver. 33) is given in ver. 25, and called the Harodite. Here "a Hararite" is no doubt to be taken as the same with "the Hararite," ver. 33, since in the parallel passage, 1 Chron. xi. 34, the same name *Agee* is given. Therefore we read: "Shammah the son of Agee, the Hararite."—"And the Philistines were assembled *at Lehi.*"† So we must render [and not: into a troop], because the words "there" and "assembled" both presuppose the name of a place (Then., Ewald). Chron. has: "to battle," no doubt from ver. 9.—*Lehi* (= "jaw-bone") = Ramath Lehi, where Samson smote the Philistines with the jaw-bone of an ass, Judg. xv. 9, 14, 17, 19. In Josephus' time the place was still called *Siagon* (Σιαγών, "jaw-bone," *Ant.* 5, 8, 8, 9). The Philistines had encamped in a lentil-field, because they found provision there (instead of "lentils," Chron. has "barley" [probably both barley and lentils were found there.—Tr.]). The Israelites had fallen back. Then Shammah planted himself in the field, took it from the Philistines and smote them. A situation like that of vers. 9, 10, is here described in short, sharp strokes, and the hero's victory extolled as the immediate gift of God.

Vers. 13–17. *Exploit of three other principal heroes of David,* whose names are not given. Instead of the text: "thirty," the marginal reading "three" is to be taken (with Chron. and all the Versions). As *the Art. is lacking* both here and in Chron., the heroes here named are not the chief three above (De Wette, Jos.), but other three out of the list, ver. 24 sqq.‡—**And three of the Shalish-men** (that is, the life-guardsmen, knights, see on ver. 8) **went down,** that is, from the heights of the mountains of Judah. The masoretic text has: "three of the *thirty,*" but instead of "thirty" we are to read "shalish-men" (Then.), as in ver. 8.—[There is no need to change the text. We have here an anecdote of three of the thirty afterwards mentioned. Perhaps this anecdote interrupts the list proper, in which Abishai should follow immediately after Shammah (Wellh.); but it is also possible that Abishai and Benaiah were two of the three here engaged.—Tr.]—"Three of the knights, *captains*" [Eng. A. V.: "three of the thirty *chief*"]. The ראש is to be rendered as in ver. 8 ("head"), but is here postposed as apposition

* The Qeri and Chron. insert the Art. before גִּבֹּרִים. But there is nothing strange in the absence of the Art., as Böttcher remarks against Thenius, who would read בִּשְׁלֹשֶׁי הַגִּ׳, thinking it necessary on account of following references (vers. 12, 16 sqq.). On the stat. abs. of the Numeral before the Subst, see Ges. § 120, 1.

† Against our text is 1) the following שָׁם "there," which supposes a preceding name of a place, 2) חֵרֵף takes not בְּ, but the Accus. (xxi. 21; 1 Sam. xvii. 10, 25 sq., 36), 3) the failure of the Rel. Pron. before נֶאֶסְפוּ "were assembled." Instead of בפ׳ read וְהפ׳ "and the Philistines."

‡ By erroneous passage from הפ׳ נֶאֶסְפוּ (ver. 9) to the similar וַיֵּאָסְפוּ פ׳ (ver. 11).

* Vulg.: *populus qui fugerat reversus est.* According to Thenius an אֲשֶׁר נָס "who had fled" (comp. ver. 11) seems to have fallen out after "the people" If this be rightly taken as probable (Ew.), then there is the less propriety in explaining the "went up" with Thenius as above mentioned.

† The masoretic pointing לַחַיָּה came no doubt from the וְחַיַּת in ver. 13. [לֶחֱיָה would be the proper name Lehi with ה local, — "to Lehi."—Tr.]

‡ This is favored also by the מֵהַשְּׁלֹשִׁים ראש, which introduces them as other persons.

(="captains"). The text, however, is difficult.* "In the harvest-time" (אֶל־קָצִיר†), for which Chron. has: "on the rock;" but there is no reason to reject our text as spurious, since the rendering "in harvest-time" is not set aside by the context (Then.).—**To the cave of Adullam**, see 1 Sam. xxii. 1. According to the situation here described this exploit occurred in the Philistine war narrated in v. 17 sq.—"And the troop (חַיָּה, Num. xxxv. 3; Ps. lxviii. 11 [10]; 1 Sam. xviii. 18) of the Philistines encamped in the valley of Rephaim." Thenius thinks that (on account of the "post, garrison" of ver. 14) the "host" of Chron., as a larger body, is to be read instead of the "troop" of our passage; but this cannot be established. On the valley *Rephaim* see on 1 Sam. v. 18.—Ver. 14. On the "post" (מַצָּב) see 1 Sam. xiii. 23; xiv. 1, 4.‡—Ver. 15. "Who will give me to drink?" that is, Oh that some one would, *etc.*, (Ew. § 329 a). Clericus explains this exclamation of David from his desire to see Bethlehem soon freed from the enemy's siege; but this does not accord with the idea of appetite that especially belongs to this verb. The connection does not indicate that David wished to refresh himself after a *hot fight* (Ew.). Perhaps the water was bad or failed, and he had a longing desire for water from the well "at the gate," which was perhaps particularly good. The traditional "David's Well" lies half an English mile from the present Bethlehem, and is, according to Ritter (*Erdk.* xvi. 286) "deep, and well provided with clear, cool water." Comp. Tobler, *Bethlehem*, p. 10.—Ver. 16. The camp of the Philistines was in the valley of Rephaim in the direction from Adullam towards Bethlehem; comp. the local statements in 1 Sam. xxii. 1, 2 Sam. v. 18.—David would not drink the water, but **poured it out to the Lord**, not in thanksgiving for the preservation of the heroes (Jos.), nor as prayer for forgiveness of his fault in sending them into such deadly peril (Kennicott), but to honor the Lord (Vulg.), as an offering to the Lord, to whom alone it ought to belong, since it was too costly for David.—Ver. 17. His reason: **Far be it from me, O Lord! to do this.** One would expect here the usual form of an oath:§ "the Lord forbid that I should do this" (1 Chron. xi. 19, Syr., Chald., Then.). "But," rightly remarks Böttcher, "the Chronicler and the modern critics have failed to note the difference in the situation. *Here* David pours out a drink-offering to Jahwe, and in connection with it, invokes him; *here*, therefore, the elsewhere unusual vocative is necessary."—"Should I [or, shall I] drink the blood of the men, *etc?*" Not: "The blood of the men, *etc?*" (interrogation with aposiopesis, Ew. § 30 3 a), which would be too unclear (Böttch.). The words do not permit Movers'* rendering: "is it not the blood?" [so Eng. A. V.]. The verb "drink"† must be supplied, and the sense is: should I drink this water, which has the same value for me as the blood of these heroes, since they brought it "at the price of their souls," at the risk of their lives? According to Lev. xvii. 11 the soul [life] is in the blood; to drink this water would be equivalent to drinking the blood of these men.

Vers. 18–23. *Feats of two other heroes of David.*—Ver. 18 sqq. *Abishai*, see 1 Sam. xxvi. 6. He was (as Jashobeam), a chief man, captain of the shalish-corps. (Erdmann retains the text (Kethib) *shalish*, Eng. A. V. follows the margin (Qeri): "chief of (the) *three*;" but it seems better to read: "chief of the *thirty*." Abishai and Benaiah attained to fame and distinction among the thirty, without reaching to the three (vers. 8-12).—Tr.] **He brandished his spear over,** *etc.*, as in ver. 8. **And he had a name among the three,** Jashobeam, Eleazar and Shammah. Among these greatest heroes he had a name for heroic bravery.—Ver. 19. But also **above the Shalish-corps (knights) was he honored.** Our text reads: "above the *three* he was honored," but, while the "three" at the end of ver. 18 is to be maintained against Thenius (who would unnecessarily change it to *Shalish*), here it must be regarded as a scribal error, and changed to *Shalish*, partly because of the following words: "and he became their captain," partly because of the relation of these words (which indicate his position) to the "chief of the Shalish" in ver. 18.—The text here is as to one word (הֲכִי‡) unintelligible, and must be changed after Chron., so as to read: "above the Shalish he was doubly honored," so that **he became their leader**, which answered to his position as "chief of the Shalish-corps" (ver. 18). **But to the three** (first) **he attained not**, they were beyond him in bravery and heroic achievement. [Dr. Erdmann thus, by somewhat arbitrary changes of text, brings out of this list a Shalish-corps with Abishai as captain; but we hear nothing elsewhere of such a corps, and it seems foreign to the design of this list to mention it. Moreover, the statement in ver. 23 concerning

---

* Of the Versions רֹאשׁ is found only in the Chald., and Thenius would thence regard it as an [inserted] explanation of the preceding word. But it is perhaps better to detach the ם from the preceding word (which would then end in ־ֵי, as in ver. 8), prefix it to רֹאשׁ, then insert הַצּוּר (as in Chron., omitting עַל), and render: "descended three of the knights from the top of the rock."

† [This phrase cannot be rendered: "*in* the harvest-time," and it would seem better, therefore, to adopt the reading of Chron., or Erdmann's suggestion in the preceding note.—Tr.]

‡ ["The hold" in which David found himself, was a strong-hold or fortress near the cave of Adullam.—Tr.]

§ מֵיהוָה (1 Sam. xxiv. 7; xxvi. 11) instead of יְהוָה.

* This would require: הֲלֹא זֶה דָּם.

† אֶשְׁתֶּה (Sept., Vulg.) may easily have fallen out after בְּנַפְשׁוֹתָם by homœoteleuton.

‡ הֲכִי is not to be taken as a *question*, equivalent to a lively asseveration (= is it so that? = certainly, comp. ix. 1; Gen. xxvii. 36; xxix. 15); "he was certainly honored"—"for what is a question doing in the midst of this perfectly smooth narration?" (Then.); nor is it to be explained as having arisen from the preceding ה and an inserted כִּי. Instead of this unintelligible reading the text of Chronicles is to be taken, only pointed בַּשְּׁנַיִם, "in two, double." Comp. Ewald § 269 *b*. [It is easier to suppose הֲכִי an insertion than to get it out of בשנים, though the presence of the latter in Chron. is not easily explained. Wellh. suggests הִנּוֹ "behold, he" for הֲכִי.—Tr.]

Benaiah seems to be parallel to that in ver. 19 concerning Abishai, and ver. 23 gives a clear and appropriate sense, in accordance with which it is better to render ver. 19: "He was more honorable than the thirty, and became their captain, but did not attain to the three." Thus, between the three and the thirty we have the two eminent soldiers, Abishai and Benaiah, of whom the first was made Captain of the Thirty, and the second Privy Councillor. The change of text required in order to give this reading (that is, to conform ver. 19 to ver. 23) is slight, involving only the alteration of *ah* to *im*.—Tr.]

Vers. 20–23. **Benaiah**; first, his *person* and *character*. **The son of Jehoiada**, according to 1 Chronic. xxvii. 5 the priest Jehoiada (compare ch. xii. 27); he was (viii. 18; xx. 23) the commander of the body-guard (Cherethites and Pelethites), and became (1 Kings i. 35) in Joab's stead commander-in-chief of the army. He was the son of an honorable man. As both texts have the "son," it is not to be stricken out (Ew., Berth., Then., Bötttch.), though of the Versions only the Chald. has it. Not: "the son of a *valiant* man"—that would not suit the *priest* Jehoiada—but: "of an upright, honest, capable* man" (as in Numb. xxiv. 18; 1 Kings i. 52; Ruth iv. 11; Prov. xii. 4: xxx. 10, 29). [It is not probable that, after the name of his father has been given, he would then be described afresh by this general phrase: "son of a man of force;" in spite of the concurrence of the two texts (Sam. and Chron.) in retaining the word "son," it is better to omit it.—Tr.].—He was "rich in deeds." **Of Kabzeel**, in the south of Judah, Josh. xv. 21; Neh. xi. 25.—*His deeds:* 1) **He slew the two Ariels** [Eng. A.V.: two lionlike men] **of Moab.** Thenius (after the Sept., with a slight alteration†) renders: "he slew the two sons of Ariel, the Moabite." So also Ewald, who conjectures that *Ariel* was a name of honor of a king of Moab. But as both texts have the same reading, the renderings of Sept. and Targ. are mere conjectures. Nor can our text be translated: "two lions of God‡ (God-lions)" (De W., Böttch.) = monstrous lions; poetical expressions such as "mountains of God, cedars of God" (Ps. xxxvi. 7 [6]; lxxx. 11 [10]) [= great mountains, goodly cedars] are not suitable to wild beasts and to "historical prose" (Then.). Among the Arabians and Persians "Lion of God" is the designation of a hero, comp. Boch. Hieroz. II. 7, 63, ed. Rosenmüller; Indian princes call themselves *Dævasinha*, "god-lions" (Ew.). It was two famous Moabite heroes that Benaiah conquered and killed. Why is it so improbable (Then. [Wellh.]) that this name should have been given to two *contemporary* men of a nation? This exploit belongs, therefore, in the history of the Moabite war, of which we otherwise know little.—2) **He went down and slew the lion in the pit.**—The word (אֲרִיֵה) denotes a lion-animal, a beast that looks like a lion (Böttcher).* The Art. points out that the fact was generally known. **On the day of snow**, on a snowy day, when more snow than usual had fallen, and the lion, having approached human habitations to seek food, fell into an ordinary cistern, or a pit dug to catch him.—3) Ver. 21. **And he slew the Egyptian**; the Art. denotes that the man was known according to this account. He was a "man† of appearance," that is, a large man. Chron. has: "a man of measure," = a man of great height." Which is the original reading must be left undetermined; both denote gigantic stature, Chron, adding: "he was five cubits high, and his spear as a weaver's beam." The *heroic* nature of Benaiah's deed consisted in his going down with a *staff* to the Egyptian, who was armed with a spear. We must suppose that there was a battle, in which Benaiah stood with Israel on a *height*, while the Egyptian and the enemy were below in the plain; he showed his *skill* and *strength* by snatching the spear out of the Egyptian's hand and killing him with it.—Ver. 22. *His* name also (as Abishai's) was renowned among the three chief heroes (comp. ver. 18) [here, as there, it seems better to read: "among the thirty."‡—Tr.].—Ver. 23. Here (as in verse 19) instead of the "*thirty*" of the text, we are to read "*Shalish*" (knights). — **Above the knights he was honored** (as Abishai), but also he **came not up to the three**, the first-named three heroes.—**And David made him his privy-councillor.**—See on 1 Sam. xxii. 14. On his high military position see viii. 18 and xx. 23.—[As above remarked, it is simpler to retain the text here (as in Eng. A. V.), and make ver. 19 conform to it.—Tr.]

Vers. 24–39. *The remaining heroes* [thirty-two in number], who belonged to the corps of *Shalishim*, and, in comparison with the above-named, formed the third grade.—Ver. 24. **Asahel**, Joab's brother;§ see ii. 18. He was one of the *Shalishim* [the text reads "*thirty*"], and this designation "among the Shalish" applies to all the following names. Chron. has as superscription: "and brave heroes were" (Asahel, *etc.*).—**Elhanan**, the son of Dodo, is to be distinguished from the Bethlehemite Elhanan mentioned in xxi. 19. Instead of "Bethlehem" read "Bethlehemite;" Chron. has "of Bethlehem" [so Eng. A. V.].—Ver. 25. **Shammah**, Chron. has the *Harorite;* here correctly the *Harodite*, of Harod, Judg. vii. 1; Chron. writes the name

* חַי is certainly scribal error for חַיִל (Chron.).

† He inserts בְּנֵי and reads הַמּוֹאָבִי instead of מוֹאָב.

‡ אֲרִאֵל, more fully אֲרִיֵי אֵל. [The reading of Vulg: "two lions of Moab" is less likely on account of the following special mention of a lion. The *Ariel* of Isa. xxix. 1 is different.—Tr.]

* אֲרִיֵה (Keth.) as distinguished from אֲרִי (Qeri). [This distinction of Böttcher's is hardly sustained by usage.—Tr.]

† Instead of אֲשֶׁר read Qeri אִישׁ (Chron.).—Instead of מַרְאֶה Chron. has מִדָּה. [As אִישׁ מַר׳ (Sam.) means a "goodly man" (so Eng. A. V.), not a "large man" (Erdmann), the reading of Chronicles is to be preferred.—Tr.]

‡ [Wellh.: בִּשְׁלֹשִׁים הַגִּבּוֹר "among the thirty heroes."—Tr.]

§ [Kennicott and Böttcher think that Asahel forms a second triad with Abishai and Benaiah, and ought to be separated from the list, but the text is against this. "The early death of Asahel (ii. 32) would make it likely that his place would be filled up, and so account [in part] for the number 31 [32] in the list" (*Bib.-Com.*).—For the Captains of the several months see 1 Chron. xxvii. 1–15.—Tr.]

Shammoth (1 Chron. xxvii. 8: *Shamhuth*).—*Elika*, wanting in Chron., omitted by reason of the identical "Harodite" in the two clauses.—Ver. 26. **Helez** the Paltite, of Beth-pelet in the south of Judah, Josh. xv. 27; Neh. xi. 26. In 1 Chron. xi. 27 and xxvii. 10 stands by error "the Pelonite."—**Ira**, of Tekoa in the wilderness of Judah, see xiv. 2, comp. 1 Chron. xxvii. 9.—Ver. 27. **Abiezer**, of Anathoth in Benjamin, Josh. xxi. 8; Jer. i. 1, comp. 1 Chron. xxvii. 12.—Instead of *Mebunnai* read *Sibbekai* (1 Chron. xi. 29) the Hushathite, xxi. 18; comp. 1 Chron. xxvii. 11. —Ver. 28. **Zalmon**, of the Benjaminite family Ahoha; Chron. (ver. 29) has *Ilai* [perhaps corrupted from *Zalmon*].—**Maharai**, of Netophah near Bethlehem (Ezra ii. 22; Neh. vii. 26; comp. 2 Kings xxv. 23), now *Beit Nettif* (Rob. II. 600 [Am. ed. II. 15, 223], Tobler, 3 *Wand.* 117 sq.).—Ver. 29. **Heleb**, according to 1 Chron. xi. 30 and xxvii. 15 *Heled* = *Heldai*, also of Netophah.—**Ittai**, Chron. *Ithai*, not to be confounded with the Ittai of xv. 19 [since this was a Benjaminite, and the other a Gittite.—Tr.].—Ver. 30. **Benaiah**; read "*the* Pirathonite"* (Chron.), of Pirathon in Ephraim, now Ferata, near Nablus, comp. Judg. xii. 13.—**Hiddai** (1 Chron. xi. 32: *Hurai*), of *Nahale-Gaash* [Eng. A. V. less well: "brooks of Gaash"], near the mountain Gaash in Benjamin, Josh. xxiv. 30; Judg. ii. 9.—Ver. 31. **Abi-Albon** (Chron.: *Abiel*†) of Beth-ha-arabah = *Arabah*, Josh. xv. 61; xviii. 18, 22, in the wilderness of Judah.—**Azmaveth** of *Bahurim*, see xvi. 5; Chron. has: "the *Baharumite*" for "*Bahurimite*" (Thenius), see iii. 16.—Ver. 32 sqq. **Eliahba**, of *Shaalbon* = Shaalbin, Josh. xix. 42, perhaps the present *Selbit*.—Instead of the following text, Chron. has **Benehashem** the Gizonite, **Jonathan** the son of *Shagee* the Hararite. This is probably the correct text, since "*Bene Jashen Jonathan*" [Eng. A. V.: "of the sons of Jashen, Jonathan"] gives no sense; but probably the *Bene* ["sons"] has gotten into the text by erroneous repetition from the preceding word [Shaalboni], so that we must read simply: *Hashem*. The locality of *Gizon* is unknown. *Shammah* has probably gotten in here from ver. 11, in place of *Ben-Agee*.—**Ahiam**, the son of *Sharar* (Chron. *Sakar*, comp. 1 Chron. xxvi. 4); the *Ararite* (Chron. *Hararite* [so Eng. A. V.]).—Ver. 34. **Eliphelet** (Chron.: *Eliphal*, the *t* having fallen out). It is surprising that the text here gives not only the father, but also the grandfather, which is not done elsewhere in the list; nor does the word "son" suit before the gentilic name "the Maachathite." Chron. here (ver. 35 sq.) has: "Eliphal (-phelet) the son of Ur, Hepher the Mekarathite." The first part of the Sam. text might have arisen from that of Chron.‡ (not the converse, Thenius), while the latter part of our text is to be preferred, so that the reading will be: **Eliphelet** the son of *Ur*, **Hepher** the *Maachathite*, of *Maachah* in Gilead, see on x. 6; comp. Deut. iii. 14 and 2 Kings xxv. 23.—**Eliam**, son of Ahithophel the Gilonite; Chron. has an entirely different text: "*Ahijah the Pelonite*." On Ahithophel see on xv. 12. [This Eliam is supposed by some to be the father of Bathsheba (xi. 3).—Tr.]—Ver. 35. **Hezro**, as in the text and in Chron. [the margin has *Hezrai*, and so Eng. A. V.; *Bib. Com.* thinks this name the same with the *Hezron* of 1 Chron. ii. 5, the ancestor of Nabal the Carmelite.—Tr.]; the *Carmelite*, of Carmel, 1 Sam. xxv. 2 [south of Judah].—**Paarai**, of *Arab* on the mountains of Judah, Josh. xv. 52. Chron. has: "Naari the son of Ezbai," both names doubtless scribal errors [it is hardly possible to determine the correct reading here.—Tr.].—Ver. 36. **Jigal** [Eng. A. V.: *Igal*] the son of *Nathan*, of Zobah. Chron.: "*Joel* the *brother* of Nathan." The designation "brother" instead of the usual "son" is suspicious from its reference to the prophet Nathan, whom the "of Zobah" (in Syria) does not suit. Whether *Jigal* [Igal] or *Joel* is the original name must be left undetermined.*—**Bani** the *Gadite;* Chron.: "Mibhar the son of Hagri," probably a corruption of our text.†—Ver. 37. **Zelek** the *Ammonite*, a foreigner, as Igal of Zobah in Syria. —**Naharai** [Eng. A. V.: Nahari] the *Beerothite*, of Beeroth (see on iv. 2), armor-bearer to Joab. The text has the Plu. "armor-bearers," but the Sing. (Qeri and Chron.) is to be preferred. If several armor-bearers were meant, their names would be connected by "and."—Ver. 38. **Ira** and **Gareb**, both *Ithrites* of Kirjath jearim, comp. 1 Chron. ii. 53, see on xx. 26.—Ver. 39. **Uriah**, also a foreigner, comp. xi. 3.—**In all** 37; not including *Joab*, who, as Commander-in-chief of the whole army, is not named, but after correcting the text of ver. 34, and reading three names there instead of two. Otherwise there would be only 36 names.‡ [This seems a better explanation of the numbers than the supposition that one name in a second triad (vers. 18–23) has been omitted (*Bib.-Com.*, Phil.), for which there is no good ground. —In 1 Chron. xi. 41–47 follow *sixteen* additional names, probably heroes that "took the place of those that died, or were added when the number was no longer limited to thirty" (*Bib.-Comm.*). —Tr.].

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. *The heroes of David* here enumerated as the most prominent and important, and of whom particular exploits are narrated, represent David's whole heroic army, with which he carried on *the Lord's wars*, and gained *the Lord's victories;* they are the heads and leaders of the *people in arms*, which with its king fought the heathen nations as enemies of Jehovah's king and kingdom in Israel (comp. 1 Chron. xxvii.). Their deeds are *deeds*

---

* And omit the ו of בְּנָיָהוּ [this is unnecessary.—Tr.]

† [This reading is preferred by *Bib.-Com.*, *Abialbon* being regarded as a corruption of *Shaalboni* below, which 15 MSS. of Kennicott write ׳ עַלְבוֹן שׁ. Wellh. suggests *Abibaal* = *Abiel*.—Tr.]

‡ The אחסבי may have come from אוּר חֵפֶר.

* [The reading "son of Ahinathan" in some MSS. of Chron. is probably merely an attempt to conform this clause to the others.—Tr.]

† The מִבְחָר is probably out of מִצֹּבָה, and the בֶּן־הַגְּרִי out of בָּנִי הַגָּדִי.

‡ [Wellhausen: "More successful corrections in this list will be possible only when the proper names of the Old Testament, together with the variations of the Sept., have been all collected and thoroughly worked up." —Tr.]

of God, whereby He "works great deliverance" for his people and their king against their enemies (vers. 10, 12).

2. As the *Prophetic Office* is the organ of God's immediate *word of revelation* to the theocratic king and the chosen people, so is the *Body of Heroes* the instrument whereby God's kingdom in Israel is protected against heathen powers, and triumphs over them. To the *School of the Prophets*, which gathered around Samuel, and whence came the heroes of the word and the Spirit, answers the *School of Heroes* gathered about David, whence came those whose forms are here slightly sketched. In them is mirrored the splendor of the royal power and glory of the Anointed of the Lord, to whom, as the visible representative of God among His people, they are devoted body and soul, and in whose person they serve the invisible Lord and King of His people with inviolate fidelity even unto death. These heroes "know themselves to be the banner-, shield-, and armor-bearers of him who stands at their head, not by human commission, but by divine investiture—to be the divinely-appointed watchmen and guardians of hearth, throne and altar, of the noblest and most inalienable possessions of their people, against attacks from without and from within. As the armed population of the land they form the brazen wall of defence of God's kingdom, and the respect-compelling hedge-row of the soil in which their people ripens in body and spirit towards its God-appointed destiny. Such a rich consciousness must have given David's warriors a peculiar exaltation of feeling; it imparted to them the true knightly sense, which alone up to the present hour has conferred true nobility on the profession of the soldier" (F. W. Krummacher).

2. A beautiful and touching proof of the *love* and *fidelity* that bound these heroes of David to their lord is given in the reckless devotion with which they put their lives in peril to gratify a casually expressed wish of his. Though in form it may seem to be a piece of foolhardiness, the moral kernel in it is the faithful, self-sacrificing love, which perils even life for a neighbor, and shuns no danger, in order to serve him.

4. In David's conduct to the heroes that bring him water from Bethlehem at the risk of their lives, are set forth these things: 1) *Noble modesty*, which regards the love-offering of one's neighbor as too dear and valuable for one's-self, and declines to receive it; 2) *Sincere humility* before the Lord, which lays the honor at His feet, as He to whom alone it belongs: 3) A clear view and tender estimation of the infinite moral *worth* of *human life* in men's relations towards one another and towards God.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Where heroism and bravery put themselves exclusively in the service of God and subserve only the aims of His kingdom, the Lord causes great things to be performed through them, and often a victory to be torn from the enemies of His kingdom that they had already gained.—Even the military calling God has chosen and sanctified through His word, that through it in times of sore conflict of right against wrong and of truth against falsehood He may "work great deliverance."—A military hero should seek his highest honor in dedicating his sword to the Lord, and as a servant of God helping to work deliverance for his fatherland and his people against their enemies.—Often in history does God the Lord use *one* man's heroism and bravery to make a people great from small beginnings, or to lift it up from disgrace and downfall, or to turn its defeats into victory and triumph. Examples are furnished by every period of history.

The source of true heroism is life-communion with God, wherein deeds of arms are 1) undertaken in His fear, 2) performed for the ends of His kingdom, 3) crowned with glorious results. —*A threefold garland of victory* for the hero, who 1) bravely repulses the pressing foe, 2) mightily strikes down the foe that is already victorious and triumphing in advance, and 3) lifts up again his people's sunken courage.—*Happy the people that has heroes*, who 1) advance in God's strength, 2) courageously stake their life for God's honor and the people's welfare, and 3) are counted worthy by God to work great deliverance for their people.—*Hail to the throne that is encompassed by heroes*, who 1) find their highest nobility in the real knighthood that roots itself in true fear of God, 2) with humble heroism defend altar and throne, 3) seek their highest honor in being God's instruments for the aims of His kingdom and for the revelation of His power and righteousness, and 4) set the whole people an example of self-devoting love and fidelity, and of unterrified courage.

TUEB. B.: Even the soldier's calling is well-pleasing to God, especially when he wages the Lord's wars.—CRAMER: Bravery and other gifts of God should be directed not to arrogance and display and oppression of the poor, but to the maintenance and propagation of the kingdom of God and of His righteousness.—Ver. 10. Through bodily strength, however great, nothing can be performed where God does not give the success (Jer. ix. 23).—Ver. 12. STARKE: We may indeed glory in and praise heroes for their heroic deeds; but it must be so done that God shall keep His honor and His glory (Psa. cxv. 1).

Ver. 16. F. W. KRUMMACHER: A knightly deed this! But was it not rather foolhardiness, if not downright servility, and was not this expending courage recklessly, and dealing wastefully with human life? This question resembles that with which Judas Iscariot presumed to censure the anointing of Mary at Bethany. True love has its measure in itself, and in its modes of manifestation puts itself beyond all criticism.—The joyfully self-sacrificing deed of the three heroes regarded not so much the *man* David, as rather the "anointed of the Lord," and so the Lord Himself. [Hardly.—TR.].—SCHLIER: David's pious mind would have no right over the life of his men; that the Lord alone had, to whom all belongs. We have no right to claim for ourselves the sweat and blood of others; men do not exist for us, but we exist for others. We should not get ourselves served, but should rather serve others.—Genuine fear of God shows itself in this, that one serves another in self-devoting and self-sacrificing love, such as was mutually shown by David and these three heroes.

[Vers. 15–17. *The well by the gate of Bethlehem.*

David's circumstances. Recollections of youth, longing for the water he used to drink when a boy at home. Strong affections which a great soldier awakens in his followers—they are eager to gratify his slightest wish. Romance of military life—brave men love sometimes to go off on an unpractical adventure. David's regard for human life; affectionate gratitude to his men; generous sentiments overcoming bodily appetite; devout desire to honor Jehovah.—Tr.]

SIXTH SECTION.

The Numbering of the People and the Plague.

Chap. XXIV. 1–25.

1 And again the anger of the Lord [Jehovah] was kindled against Israel, and he
moved [incited] David against them to say [saying], Go, number Israel and Ju-
2 dah. For [And] the king said to Joab the captain [Joab and the captains[1]] of the
host which was [were] with him, Go now through all the tribes of Israel, from Dan
even [*om.* even] to Beersheba, and number ye the people, that I may know the
3 number of the people. And Joab said unto the king, Now [*om.* Now[2]] the Lord
[Jehovah] thy God add unto the people, how many soever they be, an hundred-
fold, and that the eyes of my lord the king may see it; but why doth my lord the
4 king delight in this thing? Notwithstanding [And] the king's word prevailed
against Joab, and against the captains of the host. And Joab and the captains
of the host went out from the presence of the king, to number the people of Israel.
5 And they passed over Jordan, and pitched in Aroer on the right side of the city
[*better*, and began from Aroer and from the city[3]] that *lieth* in the midst of the ri-
6 ver [valley] of Gad [toward Gad] and toward Jazer. Then [And] they came to
Gilead and to the land of Tahtim-hodshi [*perhaps* land of the Hittites to Kadesh],
7 and they came to Dan-jaan, and about to Zidon, And came to the stronghold of
Tyre, and to all the cities of the Hivites and of the Canaanites, and they went out
8 to the south of Judah, *even* [*om.* even] to Beersheba. So when they had gone
through all the land, they came to Jerusalem at the end of nine months and twenty
9 days. And Joab gave up the sum of the number [the number of the census] of the
people unto the king; and there were in Israel eight hundred thousand valiant
men [warriors] that drew the sword; and the men of Judah were five hundred
thousand men.

10 And David's heart smote him after that[4] he had numbered the people. And
David said unto the Lord [Jehovah], I have sinned greatly in that I have done.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Ver. 2. So in 1 Chron. xxi. 2, and required by the phrase "with him," and by the plural verb "number ye."—Tr.]

[2] [Ver. 3. Böttcher shows (against Thenius) that the וּ here must be given up (it is wanting in Chron.). Erdmann retains it.—Tr.]

[3] [Ver. 5. Syr., Vulg.: "came to Aroer (Syr.: Sarub) on the right of the city." But the reading (given above in brackets) of the Holmes MSS. 19, 82, 93, 108, as cited by Wellh., commends itself as more natural. We should not here expect the statement that they encamped, but it is natural that the point where they began should be mentioned; moreover the phrase: "on the right of the city" is a strange one. The amended text would read: וַיָּחֵלּוּ מֵעֲרוֹעֵר וּמִן הָעִיר.—Tr.]

[4] [Ver. 10. The אַחֲרֵי־כֵן (which is an Adverb) here followed by the finite verb סָפַר is contrary to usage. Either, one of the two (the "afterwards" or "he numbered the people") must be omitted (Wellh.), or עַל אֲשֶׁר must be inserted: "after this, because he had numbered" (*Bib.-Com.*), or אֲשֶׁר must be written instead of כֵּן, and the Conjunction retained (as in the Vulg. and Eng. A. V.).—What the Pisqas in vers. 10, 12 signify, is uncertain.—Tr.]

And now, I beseech thee, O Lord [Jehovah], take away the iniquity of thy ser-
11 vant, for I have done very foolishly. For when David was up [And David arose]
in the morning—[*ins.* and] the word of the Lord [Jehovah] came unto the prophet
12 Gad, David's seer, saying, Go and say unto David, Thus saith the Lord [Jehovah],
13 I offer[5] thee three *things;* choose thee one of them, that I may do it unto thee. So
[And] Gad came to David, and told him, and said unto him, Shall seven [*better*
three[6]] years of famine come unto thee in thy land? or wilt thou flee three months
before thine enemies, while they pursue thee? or that there be three days' pestilence
in thy land? now advise, and see what answer I shall return to him that sent me.
14 And David said unto Gad, I am in a great strait; let us fall now into the hand
of the Lord [Jehovah], for his mercies are great; and let me not fall into the hand
of man.

15 So [And] the Lord [Jehovah] sent a pestilence upon Israel from the morning
even [*om.* even] to the time appointed; and there died of the people from Dan
16 even [*om.* even] to Beersheba seventy thousand men. And when the angel [And
the angel] stretched out his hand upon Jerusalem to destroy it, the Lord [and Je-
hovah] repented him of the evil, and said to the angel that destroyed the people, It
is enough, stay now thine hand. And the angel of the Lord [Jehovah] was by the
17 threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite. And David spake unto the Lord [Jeho-
vah] when he saw the angel that smote the people, and said, Lo, I have sinned, and
I have done wickedly; but these sheep, what have they done? let thine hand, I
pray thee, be against me, and against my father's house.

18 And Gad came that day to David, and said unto him, Go up, rear an altar unto
19 the Lord [Jehovah] in the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite. And David,
20 according to the saying of Gad, went up as the Lord [Jehovah] commanded. And
Araunah looked, and saw the king and his servants coming on toward him; and
Araunah went out, and bowed himself before the king on his face upon the ground.
21 And Araunah said, Wherefore is my lord the king come to his servant? And
David said, To buy the threshing-floor of thee, to build an altar unto the Lord
22 [Jehovah], that the plague may be stayed from the people. And Araunah said
unto David, Let my lord the king take and offer up what seemeth good unto him;
behold, *here be* [are] oxen for burnt sacrifice, and [*ins.* the] threshing-instruments
23 and *other* [the] instruments of the oxen for wood. All *these things* did Araunah, *as*
a king, give unto the king [All gives Araunah, O king, to the king; *or*, the whole
gives the servant of my lord the king to the king[7]]. And Araunah said unto the
24 king, The Lord [Jehovah] thy God accept thee. And the king said unto Arau-
nah, Nay, but I will surely buy it of thee at a price, neither will I [and I will not]
offer burnt-offerings unto the Lord [Jehovah] my God of that which doth cost me
nothing. So [And] David bought the threshing-floor and the oxen for fifty she-
25 kels of silver. And David built there an altar unto the Lord [Jehovah], and of-
fered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings. So [And] the Lord [Jehovah] was en-
treated for the land, and the plague was stayed from Israel.

[5] [Ver. 12. נֹטֵל "lay upon;" Eng. A. V. rather translates the verb in Chronicles (ver. 10) נֹטֶה "stretch out." Erdmann: "I hold over thee;" Philippson: "I lay before thee."—Tr.]

[6] [Ver. 13. So Chron. (ver. 12), and so the symmetry of the statement requires.—Tr.]

[7] [Ver. 23. So Böttcher, writing אֲדֹנִי for ארונה and inserting עֶבֶד. The words must be regarded as part of Araunah's speech, since it is not true that he gave the things to the king; he offered them, but they were not accepted (Wellh.).—Tr.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

I. Vers. 1–8. *David's sin in numbering the people.*

Ver. 1. **And again the anger of the Lord was kindled.** The "*again*" evidently refers to the famine in xxi. 1–14; comp. especially ver. 1 and the identical endings of the two accounts (ver. 25 here and ver. 14 there): "Jehovah (God) was entreated for the land." From this both sections may be inferred to be from the same source. [Hence some regard xxi. 15–xxiii. as inserted in the midst of this history, and the two poems xxii., xxiii. 1–7 as an insertion in the narrative xxi. 15–22, xxiii. 8–39. Erdmann regards these various sections as separately selected, and put together according to a definite plan.—Tr.]—*The additions* in the parallel section 1 Chron. xxi. 1–22, are to be referred to another fuller au-

thority that the Chronicler had before him (Mov., Ew.), but not also *in part* to "pure remodeling by the Chronicler himself." (Ew.).—The *time* of this census is certainly to be put in the later years of David's reign, "partly because the pestilence here described is expressly said to be the second of the two great plagues under David, partly because such a measure as the census, which occupied Joab 9 months and 20 days, could have been begun only in a perfectly quiet year" (Ew.). It cannot belong to the time before the insurrections of Absalom and Sheba (Seb. Schmid), because it presupposes a *permanent* condition of peace without and within. The late date is also favored by the fact that the Chronicler attaches immediately to this history (in accordance with its conclusion, the purchase of Araunah's threshing-floor as the site of the future temple) the description of the preparations for the building of the temple and David's arrangements for divine service, which Chron. puts in this peaceful last period of his reign. "One would not, indeed, think of David's very last days, when death was daily before him; such great matters are not undertaken at such a time" (Hengst.).—The kindling of *God's anger* presupposes a grave *offence* against God; and this not merely by *David* (whose guilt is expressly affirmed in vers. 3, 10, 12 sqq.), but also by the whole *people*, since "Israel" is designated as the object of the divine anger (ver. 1), and the punitive plague was intended to include the whole nation (ver. 13 sq.). This offence of the people consists, however, not in any "hidden sins" (D. Kimchi), nor in the insurrections under Absalom and Sheba (Keil), but (since God's anger is obviously causally connected with *David's deed*) in their *participation in David's sin*.—**And He incited David against them**, that is, against *Israel*, and the subject of the Verb is *Jehovah*, not Satan (so several older expositors [and Ewald] after Chron.), nor David's thought of numbering the people (Theod.) The outburst of God's wrath against Israel is produced by a sin of David's, to which the "incitement came from the Lord;" the statement in Chron: "Satan* stood up against Israel and incited David" is not in contradiction with this, since Satan is not an independent agent alongside of God, but appears always as subject to and dependent on Him. Job i.; Zech. iii. Buddæus' explanation: "God and the devil may *concur* in one and the same evil deed, though in different ways, the latter by impelling, the former by permitting" must be corrected in accordance with this statement.—"The Lord incited David" means, not that He destroyed his free will and forced him, but that He permitted the temptations, resident in the circumstances ordained by Him, to approach David, and so developed the germinal ungodly desire in David's heart into a determination of the will, and thence into the deed. See on 1 Sam. xxvi. 19, and "Historical and Theological" to that chapter [see James i. 13, 14; there is here involved the whole subject of the co-relation of divine and human action, about which we can only insist on the two unharmonizable facts of the absolute efficient control of God, and the complete independence of man.—Tr.]—**Saying, go, number Israel and Judah!** David's *aim* in this census could not have been pleasure at the great number that it would show, and at the growth and well-being of his subjects thus brought out (S. Schmid and other older expositors); that would have been a childish undertaking, considering the great expenditure of time and strength made. Ewald (*Hist.* III. 218, *bibl. Jahrb.* 10, 34 sq.) holds that his purpose was to perfect the royal power internally, and establish a strict rule that should embrace the whole life of the nation; the census, he thinks, was intended "to drag the people as far as possible" into all sorts of taxes, such as existed in Egypt and Phenicia, and on *this* supposition he bases the opinion that the people, apprehensive of the subversion of their liberty by the royal power, withstood this innovation, and David had consequently to recede from the complete execution of his measure. But there is not a sign in the narrative of such a purpose on David's part; and against it is the *military* character and aim of the measure. Apart from 1 Chron. xxvii. 23 sq. (according to which it was connected with the military organization of the people, and probably intended to complete it), it is here discussed in the council of military officers, and executed by Joab the commander-in-chief himself in conjunction with them; and the census took account not of *all* classes of the people, or of all independent men, but only of "valiant men that drew the sword." As is stated at the outset, military camps were formed for the numbering (mustering). "The military character of the procedure is clear also from the fact that Joab delayed as long as possible carrying it into Benjamin, in order not to arouse the insurrectionary spirit of this tribe, which could not forget the leadership it had possessed under Saul" (Hengst., *ubi sup.* p. 128).—Ver. 2. The king said to Joab: **Go now through all the tribes of Israel, . . . and muster ye the people, that I may know the number of the people**—a general mustering for a military-statistical purpose. That is, after having subjected foreign nations and established internal order and quiet, David wished to know the military force of the whole people. [Render: "the king said to Joab and to the captains (or princes) of the host that were with him."—Tr.]—*In itself* this census by David was no more sinful than that of Moses, Ex. xxx. 12 sq. Wherein *David's sin* consisted is indicated in Joab's words in ver. 3: **May now the Lord thy God add to the people, as it is, a hundred-fold, and may the eyes of my lord the king see it! but why does my lord the king delight in this thing?** The speech has the form of a conclusion* from what precedes, and indicates that Joab perceives David's purpose to be to please himself with the exhibition of the imposing military strength of his people;

* [*Bib.-Com.* (on 2 Sam. xxiv. 1) renders this "an adversary" (otherwise unknown), on the ground that the Art. (found in Job and Zech.) is wanting, and similarly translates here "one (an unknown enemy) moved David." But the absence of the Art. in the late-composed Chron. is explained by the fact that *Satan* had then become a proper name, and here the natural connection points to *Jehovah* as subject; if another person had been concerned, distincter mention would have been made of him.—Tr.]

* Indicated by the וְ before יֹסֵף, as in 2 Kings iv. 41; Ps. iv. 4 [3], comp. Ges. § 155, 1 *d*. [Against this see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

and the question at the end conveys a moral reproof. The ungodly feature in this undertaking, therefore, was its motive, David's haughty over-estimation of himself and his people. His sin was one both of *the lust of the eyes* and of *pride*. *So much* is *true* in Josephus' explanation (followed by Bertheau), which is otherwise incorrect, namely, that David's sin consisted in his not demanding the expiation-money that, according to Ex. xxx. 12 sqq., had to be paid by every man mustered; for this requirement of the law (the aim of which was: "that there be no plague among them") had reference to the danger in such a census of falling into *haughtiness* and *presumptuousness*. "David wished to glory in the multitude of the people" (S. Schm.). And the punishment that followed the attempt—so that the number of warriors was diminished, and the result of the census was not noted in the State-annals (1 Chron. xxvii. 24)—shows that it was made in proud self-feeling without the will of the Lord, Israel's true king, and for a self-chosen end that did not accord with the aims and purposes of the Lord. It is going too far to regard it as David's purpose here to summon the whole nation to war for new conquests (J. D. Mich.), or to transform the theocratic State (Kurz in *Herz*. III. 306). Such a complete recession from the dependence of his kingdom on the Lord, such thought of a *political* world-dominion of Israel, such a complete abandonment of Israel's national-theocratic calling, presupposes a complete defection on David's part from the living God. But doubtless he who had led Israel to so lofty a height, forgetting himself before the Lord, had a proud desire to exhibit the splendid array of his people's military strength, as pledge of the further advance of his house and people, and of the future development of the promise: "thine enemies shall cringe before thee, and thou shalt tread on their high-places" (Deut. xxxiii. 29). "To this height David now thought he could advance without God; the annals should show for all time that he had laid the foundations of this mighty work of the future" (Hengst.). The people also, filled with proud national conceit of their strength, shared David's sin. Though the *chief fault* was not with the people (Hengst.), yet the *solidarity* [unity] *of David's sin and his people's* in this haughty anti-theocratic movement, is beyond doubt.—Ver. 4. David submits, indeed, to Joab's opposition now also (comp. iii. 27; xix. 1–7); but he did not follow the voice of good conscience that he heard from his mouth. **The word of the king prevailed against Joab**, comp. 2 Chron. xxviii. 3; xxvii. 5; not: "stood fast" (De W.).* "It is noteworthy that such a man as Joab, without living fear of God, but with natural directness and sound practical sense, sees sooner than David, how such a sinful exaltation does not become a king of Israel" (O. v. Gerl.). "Nothing more was said in opposition" (Grotius). In silence Joab and the officers obey their lord's command; they went out "before the eyes"† of the king.

Ver. 5. Exact *geographical statement* of the beginning of the census. It began beyond the Jordan in *Gad*, "because military affairs were in an especially flourishing condition there,* comp. 1 Chron. xii. 8 sqq., 37" (Then.) Comp. Thenius' remarks on 2 Kings xv. 25. **And encamped at Aroer on the right of the city**; they encamped in the plain instead of going into the city, because of the large number of men engaged in taking the census, and so they doubtless did hereafter. [Another reading, in some respects better, is: "they began from Aroer and from the city." See "Text. and Gram."—Tr.] **In the midst of the brook-valley of Gad**, that is, not in the vale of the *Jabbok*, as the greatest river in Gad (Winer, *s. v. Thäler* and *Aroer*, Then., Rüetschi in Herz. *s. v. Gad*); for it is identical with the Aroer of Josh. xii. 25, which was *before Rabbah* (= Rabbah of the Ammonites), that is, between it and the Jordan; for this reason and from the statement in Judg. xi. 33 (Jephthah smote the Ammonites from Aroer to Abel Kernaim) it cannot have lain so far north as the Jabbok, but is probably to be sought in the valley noted on the map south of the Jabbok in the middle of the territory of God. According to Von Raumer (p. 259) it is probably the present *Ayra* southwest from es-Salt, with which Burckhardt also probably identified it (*Reisen in Syrien, etc.*, p. 609). This Aroer in *Gad* is to be distinguished from 1) Aroer in *Judah*, southeast of Beersheba, whither David sent a part of the booty of Ziklag, 1 Sam. xxx. 28, and 2) Aroer on the right (northern) bank of the *Arnon* in *Reuben* (Josh. xii. 2; Numb. xxxii. 34. [*Bib.-Com.* holds that Aroer on the Arnon is here meant, on the ground that the description here agrees perfectly with that in Deut. ii. 36 (comp. Josh. xiii. 16), and that if Aroer before Rabbah is meant, the whole tribe of Reuben would be omitted from the census, which is impossible; and this view is the most natural. For a possible city on the Arnon see Art. *Arnon* in Smith's *Bible-Dict.*—Instead of "in the valley *of* Gad," render "*towards* Gad;" they advanced from the southern limit to Gad and Jazer.—Tr.] —They encamped† **as far as towards Jazer**, the plain in which this gathering was held extended from Aroer to Jazer; Jazer cannot, therefore, have been far from Aroer. Jazer, formerly belonged to the Ammonites, conquered from them (Numb. xxi. 32), pertained to Gad (Numb. xxxii. 35, Josh. xiii. 25), a Levitical city (Josh. xxi. 39, 1 Chron. vi. 81); afterwards Moabitic (Isa. xviii. 8); after the exile Ammonitish (Jer. xlviii. 32), conquered by Judas Maccabæus (Macc. v. 8). Burckhardt (p. 609) conjectures that the name of the old Jazer is found in the fine spring *Ain Hazir*, which he found near the ruins of a very considerable city in the valley south of es-Salt, whose water flows into the Wady Shoeb, which empties into the Jordan. But Gesenius, who agrees with this conjecture (on Burckh. p. 1062), thinks it possible that Jazer is the present Sir, a ruin at the source of the Wady Sir, which

* Vulg.: *obtinuit sermo regis verba Joab.*—Instead of אֶל־יוֹאָב should perhaps be written עַל־י׳ (Chron.).

† It is unnecessary to write מִפְּנֵי (Vulg., Syr., Ar.) for לִפְנֵי, for the latter means simply "before the king" without a necessary intimation that the king went along with them.

* [Or, because this point was exactly at the opposite end of the land (going in a circuit) from Judah.—Tr.]

† The "and to Jazer" defines not the verb "came" (Keil), but the "encamped."

flows into the Jordan, and this view is adopted by Seetzen, who found several pools at Sir (comp. Jer. xlviii. 32: "sea of Jazer"), Van de Velde and Keil (on Numb. xxi. 32). According to Eusebius (*Onom.*), "the city of Jazer extended in Gad as far as Aroer, *which is before Rabbah.*" In accordance with this Von Raumer, who regards Aroer as the present Ayra, to which the valley of Ain Hazir descends, adopts the view that this Ain Hazir is the ancient Jazer, as it is not five English miles from Ayra (p. 263).

Ver. 6. Then they came to *Gilead*, the mountain-land on both sides the Jabbok, and thence into the land of *Tahtim hodshi.* This local expression (regarded as a proper name by Cler. and De Wette, but as such yielding no sense) is variously given by the ancient Versions: Sept.: "land of the Hittites, which is Adasai" [Stier and Theile's text], or "land of Thabason" [Vat., Tisch.], or, "land of Ethaon Adasai [Alex.]; Symm.: "to the lower way;" Vulg.: "to the lower land of Hodsi." No tolerable sense can be gotten from the words except on the supposition that the text is corrupt. The first part of Böttcher's conjectural emendation "under the sea"* is a fortunate suggestion, since it requires no change in the letters, and this designation of the Lake of Gennesareth as a "sea" accords with the usage of the language [it is the "sea of Kinnereth"] and with the local statements of the narrative. But the second part of his conjecture, that *hodshi* = "like the new moon," in reference to the shape of the lake, is too far-fetched. So also Gesenius' view, that *hodshi* is a matronymic from the woman called *Hodesh* in 1 Chron. viii. 9 [= Hodshites]. Ewald's conjecture, to read *Hermon* for *Hodshi*, and render: "the lower regions of Hermon" is without support (Thenius). Thenius conjectures that *hodshi* is for *Kedshi*,† Denominative from *Kedesh*, understanding thereby the town in Naphtali near lake Merom, so that it would read: "they came into the land under the lake [sea] of *Kedesh* [Kadesh]." But this designation of lake Merom is strange, and does not elsewhere occur; nor does the term "under [or, below]" suit, we should rather expect "over [above]." Retaining the "Kedesh," it is more probable that the reference is to the Levitical city of that name in *Issachar*, southwest of the lake of Gennesareth (1 Chron. vii. 72 (vi. 57); in Josh. xix. 20; xxi. 28 = Kishion). Comp. Raumer (p. 132, Rem. 36 *b*) and the country below the lake of Gennesareth southwest in Raumer's map. This lake is often called a "sea" (Numb. xxxiv. 11; Josh. xii. 3; xiii. 27; Isa. viii. 23), called so in the last passage without further description (comp. "Galilean *sea.*" Matt. iv. 18; xv. 29; Mk. i. 16; vii. 31). Instead of Thenius' adjective form *Kadshi* ["sea of Kedesh"], it is better to read: "towards Kedesh" (קֶדְשָׁה, comp. Ges. § 90. 2 a. b), understanding the town in Issachar, and rendering: "they came into the land below the sea towards [or, to] Kadesh." Hither they came from Gilead, passing through the Jordan-plain below the Galilean sea.—[For other conjectures about this expression see Smith's *Bib.-Dict. s. v.*, *Bib.-Com.* and Philippson: this whole geographical account is omitted in 1 Chron. xxi.—Tr.]—**And they came to Dan Jaan**; according to Schultz and Van d. Velde (*Mem.* p. 306, in Von Raumer p. 125) the present ruin Danian between Tyre and Aire near Ras en Nakura. But this does not agree with the statement that Joab went from this region below the sea to Dan Jaan, thence to Zidon, and then first to Tyre, whereas according to that view he would have gone from Dan Jaan by the sea to Zidon. This route would naturally lead us to think of the Dan that formed the extreme northern boundary of Israel (comp. vers. 2, 15), the old Laish (Josh. xix. 47; Judg. xviii. 29); but the objection to this is that the name *Jaan* is not appended to this Dan in vers. 2, 15, and we must therefore seek another Dan between Gilead and Zidon. So Hengst., *Pent.* II. 194. Keil looks for it in northern Perea, southwest of Damascus, taking it to be the same that is mentioned in Gen. xiv. 14, which according to Deut. xxxiv. 1 belonged to Gilead; but that is none other than the well-known Dan-Laish. And since no other place suiting the geographical relations can be found, we hold to this (Dan-Laish), which by its position was particularly suited for a mustering [so Wordsworth and *Bib.-Com.*—Tr.]. But what does the *Jaan* mean? Bunsen remarks on this passage: "Dan-Jaan, as the name Baal-Jaan on coins shows, is a Phœnician god (literally: *Judge*, *i. e.* ruler, the *singer*,* *i. e.* player), answering to the Greek Pan, who gave the city its name." But this surname is never elsewhere found with Dan. The Vulg. has: *in Dan silvestria*, "in Dan of the wood" (יַעַר), which reading Winer, Lengerke, Ewald adopt, and render: "Dan in the (Lebanon) forest." Thenius regards *Laish* as the original reading.—**And about towards Zidon**; the "about" [= roundabout] means not the environs of Zidon, but in the direction of Dan; from the northern border they turned around towards the north-western border of the kingdom.†—Ver. 7. From Zidon they went southward, and came to the *fortified city Zor* (= "rock"), comp. Josh. xix. 29, the fortress *Tyre* built on a rock on the mainland (now *Sur*), in distinction from the insular Tyre. They came, therefore, into the territory of Asher, which bordered on that of Zidon and Tyre.—**And into all the cities of the Hivites and Canaanites**, that is, in Naphtali, Zebulon and Issachar, the region afterwards called Galilee, "in which the Canaanites were not exterminated by the Israelites, but only made tributary" (Keil). [It hence appears that even as late as this these native tribes had cities of their own. The division into *Hivites* and *Canaanites* is remarkable; perhaps these were the most prominent of the surviving native races. The Hivite territory extended down near Jerusalem (Gibeon), see Judg. iii. 3; Josh. xi. 3; what the "Canaanite" district was is not clear.—Tr.]—**And went**

* תחת ים – תחתים.

† קדשי.

* [From עָנָה.—Tr.]

† [Instead of יַעַן וְסָבִיב Wellh. proposes to read וּמִדָּן סָבְבוּ, and render: "and they came to Dan, and from Dan turned about to Zidon" (comp. the repetition of *Dan* in the Sept.), which gets rid of the *Jaan.*—Tr.]

out to the south of Judah to Beersheba, passed along the western border throughout the length of the land from Dan to Beersheba.—Ver. 8. The *return*, after *nine months* and *twenty days*. According to 1 Chron. xxi. 6 the census was not extended into Benjamin and Levi, "because the king's word was an abomination to Joab," and according to 1 Chron. xxvii. 24 Joab did not finish the numbering "because wrath therefor came upon Israel." Joab, who had entered unwillingly (ver. 3) on the execution of the king's command, had not made haste; then David saw his wrong, the plague broke out before the census was finished; the numbering had not yet begun in Benjamin, nor in Levi (which, however, was excepted therefrom by Num. i. 47–49).—Ver. 9. Statement of the *total number* of the people mustered: *Israel* had eight hundred thousand arms-bearing men, *Judah* five hundred thousand. Chron. gives a higher number for Israel, eleven hundred thousand; a lower for Judah, four hundred and seventy thousand. To explain or reconcile this difference in respect to Israel it has been supposed that there were *two countings*, one according to the private lists in cities and villages (Chron.), the other according to the digests made therefrom for the public registers (2 Sam.) (so Cornelius a Lapide)—or that Joab was *less accurate in his numbering* than the officers with him (Sanktius)—or that Chron. includes the *non-Israelites* in the Ten Tribes and the neighboring regions, about three hundred thousand (S. Schmid). Against this last is that only Israelites proper are spoken of in vers. 1, 2; the other suppositions are mere conjectures. Osiander's opinion that Chron. includes the older men is opposed to ver. 5, and D. Kimchi's, that Chron. includes also Benjamin and Levi, to 1 Chron. xxi. 6. [Others suppose that the regular army of two hundred and eighty-eight thousand men (1 Chron. xxvii. 1–15) is included in Israel in Chron., and excluded in Sam., and that a corps of thirty thousand men (commanded by the thirty, 1 Chron. xi. 25) is included in Judah in Samuel, and excluded in Chronicles. See *Bib.-Com.* on 1 Chron. xxi. 5. These conjectures are without foundation, and errors of text or errors of oral tradition must be supposed.—See notes of Wordsw. and *Bib.-Com.*, on our verse.—Tr.]. Apart from the fact that we have round numbers here, the differences explain themselves if we remember that the result of the census was not recorded in the State-annals (1 Chron. xxvii. 24), and the statements here must rest on oral tradition. The numbers are not to be taken as perfectly accurate, but there is no good reason to reject them as unhistorically *large*, since this fertile country was very thickly peopled. "We see this from the various places, whose ruins stand as near to one another, as villages in our most densely populated regions" (Arnold in *Herz.* XI. 23 sq.). Taking the military population as about one-fourth of the whole, Palestine [Israel] would have contained, according to this census, a population of from five to six million souls, which is not too large a number. Ewald (*Hist.* III. 196, Rem. 3) refers to other numerical statements about Israel, that seem to us too large, and yet must be accepted as historical, and remarks: "Though the numbers may be in part round, and sometimes exaggerated, yet in general there is no reason for doubting their historical value. If, for example, the present population of Algeria be estimated at three million, and therein from 300,000 to 400,000 arms-bearing men (see Dawson Borrer, *Campaign in the Kabylie*) Israel in such happy times as David's with its wide limits might certainly sustain a larger number." Rüetschi (*Herz.* VIII. 89): "Considering the general extent of the levies and the almost incredibly dense population of Palestine, the enormous numerical strength of the Israelitish army (1 Sam. xi. 8; xv. 4; 2 Sam. xvii. 11; 1 Chron. xxvii. 1 sqq.) cannot occasion much surprise."

II. Vers. 10–17. *The judgment of the pestilence.*—Vers. 10. David *confesses* his sin before the Lord, and asks forgiveness. **David's heart smote him**, that is, his conscience, just as in 1 Sam. xxiv. 6. Comp. 1 Kings ii. 44; Job xxvii. 6; Eccl. vii. 22. With anguish of conscience David sees that his sin is an offence against the *Lord*. As to wherein it consisted see above on vers. 1–3.—Ver. 11. "In the morning" = **the next morning**.—David had made his short penitent prayer either as he was going to sleep, or, more probably, after a sleepless night.—The word of Jehovah comes to **Gad**, see 1 Sam. xxii. 5. He is called **David's seer** as being his confidential counsellor, aiding him constantly with direction from the source of divine revelation.—**And the word of the Lord** . . . this revelation had come to Gad independently of human means or occasion.—Ver. 12. Choice between three judgments set before David. **Three things I hold over thee** (נטל), not: I lay on thee, but: I hold high over thee, namely, as a load of punishment, which is to be laid on thee according as thou choosest; the sense in Chron. (נטה) is the same: "I turn [stretch] over thee" [so Eng. A. V. here: offer thee].—Ver. 13. **Then came Gad to David.**—This is the apodosis to the protasis in verse 11: and when David rose in the morning . . . then came Gad; what intervenes is a circumstantial sentence.* Instead of *seven* years of famine Chron. (so Sept.) has *three*, agreeing with the figures in the other plagues. For this reason the reading of Chron. is to be preferred; there correspond, therefore, *three years of famine, three months of flight* before enemies, *three days* of *pestilence*.† [The *seven*‡ in Sam. may be accounted for by the frequent occurrence of that number, possibly from the seven years' famine in the history of Joseph.—Tr.].—Ver. 14. "*I am in a great strait*"—the exclamation of a tortured conscience, whose anguish is heightened by the necessity of choosing between the three punishments. David looks on the pestilence as an immediate stroke of *Gods hand*, while the other plagues make him and his people dependent on man; at the same time he looks to God's *mercy*, whence, if he fall only into God's hands, he may the sooner hope to draw comfort and help. In view of God's punitive

* [On the criticism of the text here see "Text. and Gram."—Tr.]

† תְּבוֹא, Fem. with an abstract Plu., Ew. § 317 *a*.—נֻסְךָ (Inf.) "thy fleeing"—"that thou fleest." The Sing. וְהוּא collects the צָרִים into *one* conception: "*enemy*."

‡ "The numeral letter ג was changed into ז" (Thenius).

righteousness his faith holds fast to God's mercy, and verifies itself therein.—At the close of this verse the Sept. has: "And David chose the pestilence [θάνατον], and it was the days of the wheat-harvest." But this is nothing but an explanatory remark taken from 1 Chron. xxi. 20, designed partly to make a direct statement of David's choice (which is only indirectly stated in the text), partly to account for Araunah's work at the threshing-floor (ver. 18 sq.).

Ver. 15. *Beginning, duration* and *extent* of the *pestilence*.—**And the Lord gave a pestilence,** it was a divine punishment. **From the morning**—the morning when Gad came to David (vers. 11, 13). The next words,* giving the *terminus ad quem* [Eng. A. V.: "to the time appointed;" Erdmann: "to an appointed time"], offer great difficulties.—The Sept. renders: "till the hour of breakfast," that is, the sixth hour, to which it adds: "and the plague began among the people," which Böttcher and Thenius would receive into the text. But this addition of the Sept. had its origin no doubt in the reflection that the time from morning to breakfast was too short for the effects of the plague (70,000 died) therefore the words "from the morning to, *etc.*," were regarded as defining the verb *gave* [Eng. A. V.: sent], that is, the divine arrangement in inflicting the plague, and then the plague itself was made to begin after the sixth hour. But the word "*gave*" itself includes the destructive effect of the pestilence, and the result is indicated immediately by the word "*died*."—We have then here the limit of time of the raging of the pestilence. But what is meant? up to what point? The most natural explanation: "to the appointed time" (Cler., De W., Ew.), that is, to the end of the three days (ver. 13) contradicts ver. 16, according to which the pestilence ceased through God's mercy before this time; besides the Def. Art. is wanting, while elsewhere the word in the sense of a time designated has the Art. The Art. may indeed be omitted when the word (מוֹעֵד) signifies an assembly for divine service and festival. Hos. ix. 5; Lam. ii. 7, 22. Thus Bochart (*Hieroz.* I. 2, 38, ed. *Ros.* I. 396 sq.) renders (after the Chald.), having Acts iii. 1 in mind: "the time when the people used to meet for evening prayers, about the ninth hour of the day, that is, the third hour after noon." Keil adopts this view, and thinks it favors the basis of the rendering of the Vulg.: "to the time appointed" according to Jerome's explanation (*tradit. Hebr. in 2 libr. Reg.*): "he calls that the *time appointed*, in which the evening sacrifice was offered." Against this Thenius rightly remarks† that the general expression "time of assembly" could not be used for the *afternoon-* or *evening*-assembly. Thenius' conjecture (suggested by the Chald.): "to the time of lighting" (the lamps in the sanctuary or in dwellings) is declared by Böttcher to be contrary to Heb. usage; and Böttcher's reading: "up to the time of food" is unsupported. The same thing is to be said of Hitzig's suggestion: "up to the time of dinner." Instead of adding another to these doubtful, in fact unsuccessful attempts to gain a new text, it seems requisite to return to our masoretic text, which, since the Art is wanting, is to be rendered: "*up to an appointed time.*" Why should this phrase not give a suitable sense? In view of the fact that the Lord had in mercy determined on a point of time before the expiration of the three days (ver. 16), it is here intimated that the pestilence lasted a *shorter* time fixed by His gracious will. It must be left undetermined whether this "appointed time" falls in the first day of the plague (which seems to be indicated by the "from the morning," and "that day," ver. 18, though not necessarily, since the "morning" is the same as in ver. 11, and may point out merely the beginning of the pestilence *without* reference to the *same* day), or in the second day. In any case, however, the narrator, combining and, in Heb. fashion, anticipating what follows, means by this expression to say that God in His mercy permitted the pestilence to go on only to a determined point of time *within* the "three days."—**Seventy thousand men.**=Grotius cites the fact (*Diod. Sic.* l. 14) that in the siege of Syracuse 100,000 men of the Carthaginian army died within a short time.—[Dr. Erdmann's explanation of the "appointed time" is not a little strained; the fact that he refers to (the shortening of the duration of the pestilence) would hardly have been expressed in this way. The word seems obviously to mean: "time of assembly" (so Wellh., *Bib.-Com.*, and others), and points to some well-known gathering of the people. The most natural suggestion is that the time of evening-prayer is meant, to which some regard it as a fatal objection that the assembly for evening-prayer could not have existed in the time of David, or of the author of the Book of Samuel. But it may be replied that we do not know when the custom of thus gathering began;

* וְעַד־עֵת מוֹעֵד. Sept.: ἕως ὥρας ἀρίστου, to which it adds: καὶ ἤρξατο ἡ θραῦσις ἐν τῷ λαῷ, after which Thenius and Böttcher write: וַתָּחֶל הַמַּגֵּפָה בָּעָם.

† Thenius: עֵת־מִבְעָר, out of which מוֹעֵד by change of ב into ו and of ר into ד. Against this Böttcher shows that מִבְעָר is not a Heb. word, and (according to the use of בָּעַר) would mean *burning*, comp. Judg. xv. 14; 2 Sam. xxii. 9; he (Böttch.), after the Sept., reads סוֹעֵד "*strengthener*"—"repast," from סָעַד "to support, strengthen" by food, comp. Gen. xviii. 5; Judg. xix. 5, 8; 1 Kings xiii. 7; as, then, in Chald. סְעוּדָה means "heartstrengthening"—"food, dinner," so in Heb. סוֹעֵד "strengthener" may have meant the first meal of the day (about 11 or 12 o'clock). But against this Böttcher himself says that the form קוֹטֵל is elsewhere used only of acting *persons*; further, such a designation of breakfast occurs nowhere else; since in the passages cited סָעַד obtains the signification "strengthen" only from the connection (especially by the addition of "heart" and "food"), so much the more ought the connection to show when it is intended to mean *breakfast*, since it usually means only in general "to strengthen by food."—If *breakfast-time* is here spoken of, Thenius (following the Sept.) would take the form מִסְעָד; but Böttcher says rightly that "the language would not have used the *same* word for 'breakfast' and 'furniture' (1 Kings x. 12)." Hitzig (according to Then., p. 290 sqq.), thinks that if the ἀρίστου of the Sept. is not based on a סְעוּדָה, then to מִסְעָד (Then.) is to be preferred מָעוֹג (kitchen-cakes), which he tries to show means *prandium*.

or, it may be that there was some other regular gathering otherwise unknown to us. It is at any rate better so to render the word, whether it can be satisfactorily explained or not.—Tr.]

Ver. 16. **And the angel**, namely the angel of the Lord afterwards more exactly described ("that destroyed the people"), the embodiment of His punitive righteousness, the exactor of the judgment, the destroying angel (comp Exod. xii. 23)—**stretched out his hand to Jerusalem to destroy it; thereupon the Lord repented him of the evil.**—Chron.: "And God sent His angel to Jerusalem to destroy it." According to both accounts the pestilence ceased at the moment when it had reached Jerusalem through the will of the merciful God. This is the moment meant by the "appointed time" of ver. 15. On God's repentance see on 1 Sam. xiii. 35, "Historical and Theological," No. 1 (to 1 Sam. xiii.).—The Lord's command to His angel:—**Enough! now stay thy hand!** the "thy hand" refers to the "His hand" above. *As yet* the pestilence had not attacked Jerusalem itself; for "the angel of the Lord was at the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite." *Threshing-floors* were usually in the open air, on heights where it was possible, on account of the chaff and the dust, and for the sake of the wind, which was necessary for the purifying of the grain; comp. Judg. vi. 37; Ruth iii. 2, 15. So this threshing-floor was without Jerusalem, northeast of Zion, on the hill Moriah; see on ver. 25. The pestilence had reached the houses lying near this threshing-floor. Instead of the form *Awarnah* (ver. 16) or *Aranyah* (ver. 18), the name of the owner of the floor is to be read with the Masorites *Araunah* (vers. 20, 22, 23, 24). Chron. has *Ornan* (vers. 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23); Sept. *Orna*. Ewald: "This form of the name is un-Hebrew, but perhaps all the more Jebusite." Bertheau: "The form *Araunah* does not look like Heb., while *Orna* and *Ornan* are Heb.; for this very reason the form *Araunah* seems to rest on an old tradition." Jebusites still dwelt in the land (Josh. xv. 63), and were tributary (1 Kin. ix. 20 sq.). See on 2 Sam. v. 6 sq.; Araunah is here represented as a man of property, see on vers. 22, 23.—Ver. 17. **David saw the angel**; according to Chron. (whose account is fuller) he saw him standing by the threshing-floor between heaven and earth with a drawn sword in his hand, which was stretched out over Jerusalem. The drawn sword is the symbol of the execution* of the divine judgment, comp. Gen. iii. 24; Numb. xxii. 23; Josh. v. 13.—**David said to the Lord: I,** *etc.* By the "I"† he presents himself as the really guilty person before God, in contrast with the people, whom he declares to be innocent. According to Chron. (ver. 16) the *elders*, clothed in sackcloth and praying, shared with David the vision of the angel; the representatives of the people, therefore, confess that it has part in David's sin; see on ver. 1. "The punishment was sent for the people's own sin (ver. 1), though David's offence was the immediate occasion of its execution" (O. v. Gerl.). David is so penetrated with a sense of *his* guilt, and with sympathy with the suffering of his people, that he now prays God to visit judgment on "him and his house" alone, and spare the people as "His flock" [comp. 1 Chron. xxi. 17].

III. Vers. 18-25. *Appeasement of God's wrath by the purchase of Araunah's threshing-floor, and the erection of an altar thereon.*—Ver. 18. God's announcement of *grace* (contrasted with His announcement of *judgment*, ver. 13) is the consequence of "*the repentance of the Lord*" (ver. 16) and the synchronous *repentance of David* (ver. 17), though this did not cause God's repentance; it occurs at the same time ("that day") that God stops the plague, at the "appointed time" (ver. 15) before the expiration of the three days.—Besides his prayer David has now to make public affirmation of his guilt, and of his willingness henceforth with the people to devote himself as an offering to the Lord, by building an *altar*. [According to Chron. the angel commanded Gad to go to David; the two accounts do not exclude each other. The relation of time between vers. 16 and 18 is not clear; but God's repentance is represented as independent of David's action.—Tr.]—Ver. 19. **And David went up**; he shows *unconditional obedience* to the divine command; whereby the altar was already in *spirit* built, and the offering of an obedient *heart* well-pleasing to the Lord, was made in truth. Comp. 1 Sam. xv. 22.—Ver. 20. **And Araunah looked forth**; the verb (שָׁקַף) means "to lie out over, bend forward, see, look at, look out"—here, to look into the distance, since Araunah was working in the threshing-floor, and saw David coming from the city. Chron. more fully: "And as Ornan was threshing wheat." [Ver. 21. David announces his purpose to Araunah to buy his threshing-floor.]—Ver. 22 sqq. Araunah's unselfish readiness is shown in the fact that he takes for granted the threshing-floor is to be made over to David, does not even mention it, but offers everything on the place to be used in averting the plague: the *oxen* that drew the threshing-wagon, the *threshing-sledges* (the Plural is used because a sledge consisted of several connected iron-pointed rollers), and the *instruments* of the oxen, the wooden yokes; the "*wood*" (yokes and sledges) was for the fire, as the *oxen* for the *burnt-offering*.—Ver. 3. Render: "All this gives Araunah, O king, to the king;" the words are a continuation of Araunah's speech in ver. 22. In the ancient versions (Sept., Vulg., Syr., Ar., Chald.) the first "the king" is omitted, because, taking it as Nominative, they rightly thought it impossible that Araunah should be a king. If the words be taken as the statement of the narrator, and the "king" as Nominative, then [since it says: Araunah *gave* all this] there is a contradiction with ver. 24, where David *buys* the threshing-floor, and moreover a historically incorrect statement, namely, that Araunah was king of Jebus before its conquest by David; this view Ewald in fact adopts, against which Thenius rightly says: "this important fact would not have been stated in a single word, and it is in itself, but especially from v. 8., incredible that David should have suffered the Jebusite king to remain at his side." [For another reading: "all this gives Araunah, the servant of my lord the king, to the king" (which is also a continuation of Arannah's discourse), see "Text.

* On בְּ with הַכָּה see Ew. § 217, 2.

† [The Pronoun is emphatic in the original.—Tr.]

and Gram."—Tr.].-**And Araunah said to the king**; before this we must suppose a pause, or the repetition of the announcing formula ["Araunah said"], without intervening discourse, is to be explained by the fact that the following wish is sharply marked off from what precedes as a word of special significance and wholly new content. "The phrase 'and he said' is frequently repeated, where the same person continues to speak, see xv. 4, 25, 27" (Keil). **The Lord thy God accept thee**; the verb is used of the acceptance of persons by God in connection with prayer and offering, Job xxxiii. 26; Ezek. xx. 40, 41; xliii. 27; Jer. xiv. 12; so also here in reference to the offering that David proposes making. Sept., Syr., Arab. have "The Lord bless thee;" Böttcher proposes to combine these texts and read: "the Lord thy God accept and bless thee," after Gen. xlix. 25; Numb. vi. 24 sqq.; Ps. lxvii. 2 [1].—Ver. 24. David does not accept Araunah's offered gift (which exhibits him as a propertied man), because the offering would seem incomplete in his eyes if it were not his own *property* that he offered.—**For fifty shekels of silver**; Chron.: "shekels of *gold* in weight *six hundred*." There would be room for the supposition of an intentional exaggeration in Chronicles (Thenius), only "if it were certain that the Chronicler had before him our present text of Samuel" (Bertheau). Bochart [approved by *Bib.-Com.*], holds that the word (כֶּסֶף) means here not "*silver*," but in general "*money*," that David paid money, fifty shekels in gold-pieces, and, as gold was worth twelve times as much as silver, this was = 600 shekels in silver [according to Bochart, Chron. (ver. 25) reads: "shekels of gold of the weight (value) of 600 (silver shekels)."—Tr.]; but this contradicts the texts of both Sam. and Chron. We have to suppose a corruption of text here. Keil properly points out that, comparing the price (400 silver shekels) that Abraham gave for a burial-place (Gen. xxiii. 15), and especially the smaller value of land in his day, the price here stated, 50 shekels of silver (about 30 American dollars) seems too small. [However, Abraham's purchase was much greater in extent than this (*Bib.-Com.*), and peculiar circumstances may here have affected the price. The sum mentioned in Chron. seems too large, but of this we cannot very well judge. Some suppose that the 50 shekels were paid for the materials of the offering, and 600 for the ground (see note in *Bib. Com.* on 1 Chron. xxi. 25); but of this there is no hint in the narrative. We cannot with certainty recover the true numbers.—Tr.]

Ver. 25. The building of the altar and the presentation of the offering is the work of humble and obedient faith, whereby David testifies anew his complete devotion of heart and life to the Lord. The *burnt-offering* precedes, because by it expiation is made, and God's favor, as Araunah wished for David, restored; comp. Lev. i. 3, 4 "for his *acceptance* before Jehovah" (comp. ver. 23). Thereon follows the *peace-* and *thank-offering* (*Shelamim*). It assumes God's favor and the peaceful relation between Him and man, and on the ground of this relation, expresses thanks for divine kindnesses already received or hereafter to be received (comp. Oehler in *Herz.* X. 637).—After "peace-offerings" the Sept. adds: "And Solomon made an addition to the altar afterwards, for it was little at first." It must be left undetermined whether the Alexandrian translators found these words in their text, they being an addition by an editor or scribe (Then.), or added them by way of explanation. Certainly the place on Araunah's threshing-floor, where David built the altar and continued to offer, is the consecrated spot that he chose for the Temple, and on which Solomon built it (1 Chron. xxi. 27—xxii. 1); and this addition of the Sept. agrees with the statement of Josephus, that Araunah's threshing floor was on the hill afterwards occupied by the Temple (so Grotius).—Chr. Rosen has attempted to prove the identity of this threshing-floor on Moriah (comp. Arnold in *Herz.* XVIII. 625) with the sacred rock in the present Mosque es Sakra, which stands on the site of the ancient Temple (*Wochenblatt der Johanniter-Ordens-Balley Brand. Jahrg.* 1860 in the *Beilage* to No. 12).

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

1. The grave *sin* of proud self-exaltation, which David and the people of Israel here had in *common*, *presupposed* the elevation to victory and power that God had bestowed by His *gracious might*, and its *consequence* was the *judgment* that revealed God's anger against the perversion of His favors into plans of *self-aggrandizement*. God's *honor* does not permit a king and people to seek their own honor in the power conferred by Him. The *aims* of *God's kingdom* cannot, according to God's laws of moral order, be abridged or obscured with impunity by the aims and purposes of human pride. God's judgments fail not against false national honor and ambitious, self-seeking pride of rulers, as is shown by the history not only of Israel, but of all nations to the present time.

2. That God, angry with Israel, *incites* to the sin of numbering the people, and then *punishes* it, is no contradiction according to the theology of the Old Testament (J. Müller, *Lehre von der Sünde* I. 322), since inciting to sin does not set aside the holding one responsible for it. Man's free will is not destroyed by the divine will, and the punishment of the righteous God presupposes man's guilt. Immersed in the thought of God's all-fulfilling efficiency, the human mind does not indeed refer to it "evil as well as good" (Müller, *ubi supra*), for Old Testament theology is far from presenting the divine causality in this *like* attitude to good and evil; but the *divine activity* (in its punitive manifestations) is referred to the *external production* of evil (already present as an inward fact of man's free will, opposed to God's will), in so far as the circumstances that produce and incite to sin exist under God's government, and are used by Him as means to develop man's sin for the ends of His punitive righteousness. But also, apart from the *external* realization of sin, God gives man, who freely hardens himself in sin, *over to the judgment of the consequence* of his sin; Rom. i. 28.—"There is here not mere permission, but real action on God's part, and such as every one may see in his own experiences. He that allows the sinful disposition to rise within him is, however much he may strive against it, inevitably involved in the sinful deed,

which draws down the requiting judgment" (Hengst., *Hist.* II. 130).

3. The *root* of the sin in this census is already laid bare in the *word of the law* relating to the numbering of the people. Hengstenberg excellently remarks (*ubi sup.* 129): "If David's eye had been clear, he would have seen in *God's law* the special reference to the danger attending the numbering of the people. In Ex. xxx. 11 sq. it is enjoined that in the census every Israelite shall pay *expiatory money*, 'that there be no plague among them when they are numbered;' by this money they are, as it were, ransomed from the death that they incurred by proud conceit. It recalls the danger of forgetting human weakness, that so easily arises when the individual feels himself a member of a powerful whole. Even the slightest movement of national pride (it is an important lesson for all times) is sin against God, which, if not vigorously repelled, involves the nation in the judgment of God. Indeed the Romans with a similar feeling made an expiatory offering when they took the census."—The *greatness* of David's guilt increases with the maintained opposition of his will to the voice of God, which he hears in Joab's word, whereby his conscience ought to have been awakened. The *degree* of man's guilt against God rises with the maintained *determination of the will* against conscience *in the inner* life, with the outward *resolution* to act, with the rejection of *counsel* and instruction, whereby the attainment of better knowledge is frustrated, and with the final *performance* of the evil determination in spite of *protest* and *opposition* from *within* and from *without*.

4. The various *steps* whereon God leads men that yield their conscience to His Spirit to ever deeper humility in sincere penitence are mirrored in this *history* of David's *repentance*. First God rouses David from his *sleep of conscience* and *security* by the *result* of his boastful antigodly undertaking, so that "*his heart smote him*" (comp. for this expression, 1 Sam. xxiv. 6), that is, his conscience chastised him. So he comes to *know that* he has sinned and *how sorely*, and to *acknowledge* the *foolishness* of his sin, and to *pray* for *forgiveness* (ver. 10). But to the *inward voice* of his smiting *conscience* is added the *voice* of the *word* of God, which comes to him from without through the prophet Gad with the announcement of *punitive righteousness*. The penitence of the *heart* proves itself in humble *submission* to God's *punishing* hand, whence David instead of the asked-for pardon takes without murmuring the announcement of *punishment*, and in the unconditional *trustful self abandonment* to God's *mercy* (ver. 14). Under the sorrowful experience of *punishment* the feeling of *personal guilt* is deepened, wherefore he acknowledges *himself and his house alone* to be the proper object of the divine punitive justice (ver. 17). Having suffered himself to be led thus far on the path of penitence by God's hand, he encounters the prophetically announced *divine mercy*, which stops the punishment (ver. 18), and gives proof of the *renewed obedience* rising from the depths of true penitence, in the *deed* (commanded by the Lord) of faith and devotion of his whole life to him (ver. 19 sq.). David's repentance is *finished* and confirmed by the *building of the altar*, and *his offering* on the threshing-floor of Araunah.

On the same spot where once *Abraham*, the possessor of the primeval promises of salvation, presented the sacrifice of his faith and obedience to the Lord, the royal bearer of the *Messianic promises* presents his burnt-offering and thank-offering, and therewith consecrates the spot, on which his son was to build a house as the Lord's dwelling amid His people, and this on the ground of his experience of sin-forgiving *grace* and divine *mercy* that puts an end to punitive justice.—Hengstenberg: "It is very remarkable that before the outward foundations of the Temple were laid, God's forgiving mercy was by God factually declared to be its spiritual foundation."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The *glory* of God shows itself in *the life of His people*, not only through His abounding grace but also through His holy wrath, whose fire is kindled by the sins into which they fall through the temptations of their own flesh or of the world without.—No height of the life of faith in the pious secures from a deep fall; the richer the possession of salvation which they have received through divine grace, the greater the loss if they do not preserve it or wish in self-exaltation to boast of it as their own acquirement.—The perverse self-will of man is the fountain of all sin; its guilt is not removed when through God's action, the evil breaks forth from this fountain, and becomes a deed of disobedience to His holy will; God's manifestations of grace often become, to man fallen into carnal security, the occasion of grievous acts of sin.—God would annihilate the free will of man if he did not allow the sin, which through that free will has already become an inner deed of the heart, to work itself out in its consequences; but He does not allow this to happen without first sending forth to men the voice of warning, and the call to turn from the way on which with the sinful resolve they have entered. —If God's exhortation and warning has been uttered in vain through man's word, His voice afterwards makes itself heard so much the more loudly through the accusation of what is called an evil conscience, but should properly be called a good conscience.

The *smitings* with which God visits His people, when they have strayed into the ways of sin, are 1) those of *conscience*, in view of the *goodness* of God which became the occasion or subject of self-exaltation; 2) Those of the *word* of God, in view of the *holiness* of His will against which they have sinned; and 3) Those of *outward chastisement*, through sufferings in which punitive *justice* exerts itself.—*Whom does the heart smite for his sins?* Him who 1) Lets his heart be smitten by God's earnestness and goodness, and takes to heart the greatness of his sin in contrast to God's *loving-kindness;* 2) Recognizes his sin, in the light of God's *word*, as a transgression of His holy will; and 3) Maintains in his sinning and in spite of it the *fundamental direction* of his heart towards the living God, and has been preserved from falling away into complete unbelief.—*True and hearty repentance is preserved in the life of God's children*, 1) In the penitent confession of their sin and

guilt, before the *judgment-seat* of God, 2) In fleeing for refuge to the forgiving *grace* of God, 3) In humbly bowing under the punitive *justice* of God, and 4) In a confidence, which even amid divine judgments does not waver, in the delivering *mercy* of God.—The *gradual succession* in the inner life of a penitent sinner under the chastenings of God's love: 1) Reproving conscience, 2) Penitent confession, 3) Hearty prayer for forgiveness, 4) Humble bowing beneath the punishment imposed, 5) Unreserved submission to the divine mercy.—*Conduct of an honestly penitent man beneath the blows of God's chastening hand:* 1) He *bows* his head under the divine judgment, yet does not lose his head; 2) He is *silent* before the word of God which judges him, that the Lord alone may be justified, yet his mouth does not remain closed, but opens itself for the one word he has to utter, "Take away the iniquity of thy servant;" 3) He is *grieved* in heart in view of the punishment he has deserved from the divine justice, yet he does not cast away his confidence, but places himself in the hands of the divine mercy.—"*Mercy rejoices over judgment:*" 1) The penitent man casts himself into the arms of God's mercy; 2) Mercy falls into the arms of justice, in order to stay its blows; punitive justice must yield to mercy at the command of the Lord, "It is enough: stay now thy hand."—*Rear an altar unto the Lord!* 1) In obedience to the Lord's command (vers. 18, 19); 2) With dedication of thyself, and what is thine to the Lord's honor (vers. 21–24); 3) For the continual presentation of spiritual offerings, which are acceptable to the Lord (vers. 23, 24); and 4) For the reception of the highest gift of grace, peace with the propitiated God.

Osiander: Even the holiest people may sometimes be overtaken by their corrupt flesh (Rom. vii. 18).—Schlier: After David had given up his heart to evil thoughts, the Lord gave occasion and opportunity for these evil thoughts to break forth unto the punishment of the king as well as of his whole people. Much depends, for the understanding of the following history, upon our not forgetting this concealed background, upon our keeping well in view, on the one hand the Lord's wrath against Israel, and on the other hand the king's evil thoughts.—[Hall: O the wondrous, and yet just ways of the Almighty! Because Israel hath sinned, therefore David shall sin, that Israel may be punished; because God is angry with Israel, therefore David shall anger Him more, and strike Himself in Israel, and Israel through Himself.—Tr.]—F. W. Krummacher: Despite all the purifying processes through which we have passed, there is scarcely anything sinful to be named that cannot, even though conquered, come up in us afresh in the way of *temptation*. The most assured Christian, if his eyes are not blinded, never attains the consciousness that now he can stand justified before God in his own virtue.—[Hall: The Spirit of God elsewhere ascribes this motion to Satan, which here it attributes to God; both had their hand in the work; God by permission, Satan by suggestion; God as a Judge, Satan as an enemy; God as in a just punishment for sin, Satan as in an act of sin; God in a wise ordination of it to good; Satan in a malicious intent of confusion.—Tr.]

Vers. 2–4. Disselhoff: Even on the heights of life in God, the favored one remains the child of Adam. The jubilant cry, "*according to* my righteousness," may easily become the boast, "*on account of* my righteousness."—Starke: When kings and princes fall into sin, that means much; let us then not forget to pray for them, that God may preserve them (1 Tim. ii. 2).—Schlier: Pride sticks in the flesh and blood of us all; and the difference is only whether pride has power over us, or whether we rein in and subjugate pride. Either thou slayest pride, or pride slays thee.—[Hall: Those actions which are in themselves indifferent, receive either their life, or their bane, from the intentions of the agent. Moses numbereth the people with thanks, David with displeasure.—Tr.]—Disselhoff: Humility wishes not to know what it is and possesses, and has done. As soon as the human heart wishes to count the fruits it has brought, its trophies and its booty, piles up before itself the proofs of its faith and zeal, and contemplates them with pleasure, humility is flown, pride has returned. From pride there immediately arises self-satisfied boasting. . . . . Then the second step also is soon taken that the man no longer trusts in the invisible gracious God, but holds flesh for his arm, and in his heart turns away from the Lord,—that he wishes to see and calculate, and no longer to live by faith.

Ver. 10. J. Lange: God, the great and universal judge of the world, still holds as it were His secret inferior court in the conscience of the man, and summons him continually before his superior court (Rom. ii. 15, 16).—F. W. Krummacher. As the sun always again breaks through the clouds that veiled it, so the conscience once awakened and enlightened by the Spirit of God, however darkened and ensnared it may be, ever victoriously comes forth again, and anew makes efficient its judicial office.—Disselhoff: Before God came with the punishment, before He showed him his sin from without, David's own conscience rose up strong and living, and left him no peace till he had poured out his guilt-laden heart in sincere and earnest confession, and had supplicated forgiveness of his misdeed.—Fr. Arndt: How a man behaves after his fault, whether he persists in it, stands to his purpose, seeks to carry through his self-will and follows it out consistently to the utmost, or whether he enters into himself, humbles himself, repents, takes back, and supplicates forgiveness—that is the proof and the touch-stone for the true state of the heart. The former course is indeed apparent progress, but a progress that leads to hell; the latter is apparently going backward, but going back to heaven and blessedness.

Vers. 11–13. Starke: God is not swift to punish, but corrects in measure, only that we may not reckon ourselves innocent (Jer. xxx. 11).—God is also Lord over the kingdom of nature, and has everything therein under His government (Matt. x. 29).—Fr. Arndt: With His children the Lord is very exact. He is milder towards them, but also stricter than towards others. To whom much is given, of Him much also is required.—F. W. Krummacher: The

power to endure ills in proportion as they seem divine manifestation of *grace* should not serve to obscure the divine *justice*.—DISSELHOFF: Here lies the sinner a night in confession and supplication, and in the morning God sends him—punishment, and therewith no syllable of grace and forgiveness! We observe it with trembling. To the deeply ruined, and long-lost child the father runs with open arms to meet him, and presses him to his heart. Yet when the favored one, who has tasted the power of atonement, loses himself, when he makes the goodness of God a subject of arrogance and presumptuousness, then the Lord comes upon the penitent with the sharp edge of His sword.—He *must* punish, the eternal God, when He seees that the old nature is too tough in the new man, too deep-rooted and grown with His growth . . . but above all must He then come with the sword, when His grace and His gifts have been made the cause of the self-exaltation.

Vers. 14 sqq. CRAMER: Nowhere have we a better refuge in extremities than in the gracious hands of the Lord (Ps. xc. 1; xci. 1 sqq.).—S. SCHMID: The mercy of man is nothing in comparison with the divine mercy.—F. W. KRUMMACHER: David is conscious that the Lord "corrects His people in measure," and the cup of His holy wrath, where He neither *can* nor *should* spare them. He never extends to them without adding hidden manifestations of grace, while *men*, even where they are the executioners of God's judgments, too easily mistake their position as instruments, and pass beyond the limits of merciful moderation that were assigned them, and give free course in their bosom to the spirits of rage and vengeance.—[HALL: The Almighty, that had fore-determined his judgment, refers it to David's will as fully as if it were utterly undetermined. God had resolved, yet David may choose: that infinite wisdom hath foreseen the very will of His creature; which, while it freely inclines itself to what it had rather, unwittingly wills that which was fore-appointed in heaven.—TR.]

Ver. 16. SCHLIER: The Lord our God is a consuming fire to the sinner, and punishes, when it must be, with frightful earnestness, so that it goes through marrow and bone; but in the midst of the most awful judgments the Lord thinks of mercy. He pities us—that is the only reason why He thinks of mercy.—FR. ARNDT: O miracle of mercy! Thus does the Lord in compassion cut short the punishment, when we bow! Thus says He, It is enough, when the evil has first begun to unfold its devastating effects! Thus before the eyes of His omniscience and His compassion do need and help, beginning and end, wonderfully come together!—Ver. 17. F. W. KRUMMACHER: Not from the virtues of God's children, but from their tears for their faults, shines upon us the noblest silver light of their new life.—SCHLIER: We are willing to confess our sin, to acknowledge ourselves guilty, to be nothing, just nothing in our own eyes, and we may certainly yet experience in ourselves also that to the humble the Lord always gives grace.—[On this verse JOHN WESLEY has a sermon.—HALL: These thousands of Israel were not so innocent, that they should only perish for David's sin: their sins were the motives both of this sin and punishment; besides the respect of David's offence, they die for themselves.—HENRY: Most people, when God's judgments are abroad, charge others with being the cause of them, and care not who falls by them, so they can escape; but David's penitent and public spirit was otherwise affected. As became a penitent, he is severe upon his own faults, while he extenuates those of the people.—TR.]

Vers. 18 sqq. STARKE: Teachers must not go before God sends them (Jer. xxiii. 21).—CRAMER: As God is beginning to punish, He also thinks how He wishes to end.—SCHLIER: The repentance that comes from the bottom of the heart works great miracles; repentance draws down God's grace, repentance finds nothing but peace and blessing. The more repentance, so much the more blessing—that holds true for heart and house, and also for land and people.—DISSELHOFF: Where the Lord punishes His people, He blesses. Where He chastens is the door of heaven, there is His countenance, there He beholds, there He builds His tabernacle of peace.—Vers. 19 sqq. S. SCHMID: One prophet must hearken to another (1 Cor. xiv. 22).—Vers. 22-24. [HALL: Two frank hearts are well met; David would buy; Araunah would give. . . . There can be no devotion in a niggardly heart; as unto dainty palates, so to the godly soul, that tastes sweetest that costs most: nothing is dear enough for the Creator of all things. It is an heartless piety of those base-minded Christians that care only to serve God good-cheap.-TR.]—WUERT. B.: Penitent and believing prayer, and obedience to God's command, can accomplish much (Ps. cxlv. 18; James v. 16).

F. W. KRUMMACHER: Were God's faithfulness no more unchanging towards us than ours towards Him, what would become of us all? With this humble confession we draw near to contemplate this new *judicial proceeding between Jehovah and the king of Israel*, and inquire into its *subject*, its *course*, and its *issue*.

On the whole chapter, J. DISSELHOFF: *How God meets the presumptuousness of His favored ones:* 1) He comes upon them with the edge of the sword; 2) His sword is not to kill, but to loose the chains of pride; 3) Where the sword of the Lord has done its work, there He builds His temple of peace.

[Ver. 1. Vengeance against a nation often comes through the infatuation of its rulers.—The sin of national pride and vain-glory. "Fourth of July oratory" may be something worse than bad rhetoric.—Ver. 3. Good advice from a bad man. *Fas est et ab hoste doceri.* Luke xvi. 8. Much of life's best wisdom lies in knowing how to take advice.—Ver. 10. Delusion lasting throughout the process of performing the wrong deed, and ceasing the moment the deed is done.—Often, alas! is there occasion to say, in bitterness and shame, What a fool I have been!—Ver. 10, compared with xxii. 20 sqq. There, rewarded because righteous and wise; here, seeks to be forgiven because sinful and foolish.—TR.]

[Vers. 12, 13. How sad a consequence of sin and folly, when there is left to us only a "choice of evils," yea, a choice amid terrible calamities.—Which do we find harder to bear, which bringing more wholesome discipline, our less violent but long-continued distresses, or those which are briefer and more intense?—Ver. 14. It is always easier to endure ills in proportion as they seem

more directly and exclusively providential, with the least possible intervention of human agency.—Ver. 17. It is a very bitter reflection to a good man, that his folly and sin should have brought evil upon others. And what sin or folly ever fails to have such a result, directly or indirectly?—Ver. 24. People often say, "You can give that and never feel it." If this be true, then a devout man ought to give *more*, till he *does* feel it. Here, only what costs will pay. The widow's mite was felt deeply, for it was all she had.—Chap. xxiv. 1) David's sin. 2) His self-reproach and confession. 3) His punishment. 4) His supplication and expiatory offering. 5) His forgiveness.—Tr.]

[Upon the Life of David, the following groups of topics may aid, by way of suggestion, in devising some series of sermons.—David as shepherd, warrior, father, king, psalmist.—David's *conflicts:* with the enemies of his flock, Goliath, Saul, the Philistines in general, Absalom, himself.—David's *friends:* Samuel, Jonathan, Ahimelech, Achish, Joab, Nathan, Ittai, Hushai, Barzillai, his own sons, and best friend of all, the Lord God.—David's early piety, series of great sins, bitter repentance, subsequent chastenings, hope in death.—David's impulsiveness, generosity, penitence, trust in God, gratitude, delight in worship.—Tr.]

APPENDIX.

ANCIENT VERSIONS OF THE BOOK OF SAMUEL.

The Hebrew text of "Samuel" is in the main well supported by internal and external evidence. Yet the biographical and statistical character of the narrative has exposed it more than any other of the historical books of the Old Testament to textual corruption; it is sometimes inaccurate and unclear not only in particular words and expressions, but also in the connection of its parts. Many such cases are referred to in the Commentary and the Translator's Notes; see 1 Sam. vi., ix., xii., xvii., xviii., xx., xxvi.; 2 Sam. iv., v., xxiii. and elsewhere. For the fixing of the Heb. text we have not the Manuscript-evidence that is available for a book of the New Testament. Though there are known a large number of Hebrew MSS. of "Samuel," they seem all to be conformed to the masoretic recension (which was completed about the sixth century of our era, but probably begun some time before), whereby any differences that may have existed have vanished. The recently discovered Odessa MSS. and those brought to light by the Karaite Firkowitsch have not up to this time yielded any readings of importance; the early dates of the latter are now called in question by Strack and Harkavy. The various readings of the Talmud and the Masora present very slight differences from the received text. Assuming, then, the possibility of text-corruption from various causes, we are forced to examine the ancient Versions the more carefully as almost the only sources of materials for text-criticism. But while the Hebrew text is not to be regarded as absolutely authoritative, the text of a version has to be subjected to especially searching criticism for two reasons: 1) because the translator may have given an incorrect or free rendering, and may thus unintentionally misrepresent his original, and 2) because a version is exposed to greater textual corruption (by corrections, marginal insertions, *etc.*) than a MS. of the original, especially in the case of the Old Testament. The intentional changes in our Versions are few and usually obvious. It need not be remarked that the fixing of the text of a Version as accurately as possible must precede its employment as an instrument of criticism. In order to call the attention of those that have not used them to the critical importance of the Ancient Versions and to furnish a general guide in their use, the following brief account of the value of the versional material at hand for the text-criticism of "Samuel" is subjoined.

I. **The Greek Versions.**—Of these the only one of any special value is the *Septuagint*, which represents a Hebrew text of c. B. C. 200, far older than any known Hebrew manuscript. For an account of the Greek MSS. containing it see Tischendorf's *Prolegomena* to his edition of the Septuagint; the only readings generally accessible (for the Book of Samuel) are those of the Vatican and Alexandrian MSS., of which the latter is critically almost worthless, because it has evidently in many places been corrected after the masoretic Hebrew text. Substantially, therefore, the Vatican text (Tischendorf's edition)

must be adopted as the best now obtainable, but must itself be subjected to criticism. The text in Stier and Theile's Polyglot is eclectic, and of no critical value; the various readings of Holmes and Parsons are undigested.

The *critical value* of the Septuagint (Vatican text) version of "Samuel:"

1) Its *honesty*. It aims at giving a faithful rendering of the Hebrew, which it follows with servility, closely imitating Hebrew idioms in defiance of Greek usage, rendering particles and other words literally to the exclusion of sense, and guessing at or transferring words whose meaning was unknown. There are marginal insertions, double readings (see below) and those slight divergencies that are unavoidable in a version; but there is no trace of intentional misrepresentation. The translation does not shrink from any difficulties in its original, and may be taken as a fair rendering of the Hebrew text that the Alexandrian translator had before him.

2) Its *freedom from halachic, haggadic* and *euphemistic* elements. There is no introduction of later Jewish legal prescriptions (Halacha), even, for instance, in 2 Sam. xxiv. 15, or of legendary statements and superstitious fancies (Haggada). The two supposed cases of the latter cited by Frankel (*Vorstudien zu der Sept.*, pp. 187, 188), 1 Sam. xx. 30; 1 Sam. xxviii. 14, do not warrant his interpretation. In the first passage there is no ground to assume in the phrase: *υἱὲ κορασίων αὐτομολούντων* (deserting) an allusion to the story that Jonathan's mother was one of the maidens carried off at Shiloh (Judg. xxi.), and willingly offered herself to Saul, nor does the ὄρθιον (זָקֵף), "upright" (not "head-foremost"), of the second passage point to the belief that kings magically conjured up rose head first, while ordinary persons came feet-foremost.—It has no euphemisms for the avoidance of anthropomorphisms and unseemly expressions.

3) Its *correctness* as a translation. While in general it gives the sense of the Hebrew accurately, it is not merely lacking in smoothness and elegance, but shows a good deal of looseness and ignorance. It not seldom misreads consonants and vowels, mistakes the meaning and construction of words, and distorts the connection of sentences, and thus sometimes makes sad work with the sense, as in 2 Sam. xxiii. 1–7 (while 2 Sam. xxii. is well translated). It naturally badly miswrites proper names (apart from differences in the Egyptian and Palestinian pronunciation of Hebrew words), but shows a good acquaintance with the syntax of the Hebrew verb.

4) Its *insertions* and *omissions*. While it is true that this version of Samuel is to be considered an honest one, it must be remembered that ancient translators did not recognize the same obligation to their text that is now felt, but thought themselves at liberty to make occasional deviations from it. Still our Version takes few liberties. The shorter insertions and omissions (as of the Nominal or Pronominal subject or object, and of explanatory words and phrases) do not usually materially affect the sense; and they are not always to be referred to the translator or a copyist, but may sometimes be regarded as part of the original Alexandrian Hebrew text. To be especially noted are the *duplets* or double readings, where a second marginal rendering of a passage, or a rendering from a somewhat different recension has gotten into the text; sometimes also triplets or triple renderings are found, and these different renderings standing side by side are sometimes combined into one sentence by a copyist or a corrector. The longer insertions (1 Sam. ii. 10; 2 Sam. viii. 7; 2 Sam. xiv. 27; 2 Sam. xxiv. 25) are parallel passages or historical notices added by a reader in the margin and then inserted in the text by a copyist; but it is possible that one of these additions (2 Sam. xxiv. 25) was found in the translator's Hebrew text. The more important omissions (1 Sam. xvii., xviii.) are discussed at length in the Commentary.

5) Its *utility* for the establishment of the true text. Its relation to our present Hebrew text shows that it was not translated from the same text that furnished the masoretic recension. On the contrary, it represents as its original an *independent Hebrew text* of the 2d or 3d century B. C., and is therefore itself to be regarded as an *independent authority* for the restoration of the original Hebrew of "Samuel." As is remarked above, its character guarantees its faithful rendering of its Hebrew original, and it thus brings us face to face with a Hebrew MS. older by many hundred years than any we now possess, and, what is more important, independent of the masoretic recension. This is enough to show its great critical value.

The general result of the comparison between the Hebrew and Greek texts of "Samuel" is the maintenance of the former. Usually the Septuagint sustains the Hebrew by its agreement with it (sometimes with Kethib, sometimes with Qeri). Its divergences from the Hebrew do not always or generally make against the latter, but in many cases they do give or suggest a better text, instances of which will be found in the Translator's textual notes; see, for example, 1 Sam. xiv., xviii. and 2 Sam. xiv.

In the study of the Greek of Samuel it is recommended that Schleusner's Lexicon of the Septuagint and the Commentaries of Thenius, Böttcher and Wellhausen be used.

The other Greek versions (fragments of Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus) represent very nearly the present Hebrew text, and, being much later than the Septuagint (2d century after Christ), have not much critical value.

II. Latin Versions.—Of the Latin Versions the *Old Latin* (2d century after Christ) is a translation of the Septuagint, and has therefore only a secondary critical value as a help in settling the text of the Septuagint.

The translation of *Jerome*, the Latin Vulgate (Codex Amiatinus. edited by Tischendorf) was made from the Hebrew, but not altogether independently of the Old Latin. For several reasons it must be used with caution in the criticism of the Hebrew text: 1) where it coincides with the Septuagint against the Hebrew, it is probable that Jerome or a copyist has adopted the rendering of the Old Latin, and it is therefore not an independent authority; 2) the Hebrew text of Jerome had probably received the emendations of the Masorites, and is in so far identical with that of

existing Heb. MSS. and not an independent authority; 3) Jerome's translation is much freer than that of the Septuagint, and frequently obscures the exact form of the Hebrew.

Still the Vulgate gives a certain control over the Hebrew, and in some cases differs from both Hebrew and Greek. In such cases it may represent a variation in Jerome's Heb. text or a variation in the Greek text from which the Old Latin was made.

III. The Syriac Version.—The only known Syriac text of "Samuel" is that of the Peshito Version, given in the Paris and London Polyglots and Lee's edition, and in at least one unedited MS. in the British Museum.* A trustworthy text from existing MSS. is still a desideratum. For the control of the Polyglot text and that of Lee, we have the various manuscript-readings in Vol. VI. of Walton's Polyglot, the citations in the works of Ephrem Syrus and other Syrian writers, and the Arabic version of "Samuel" in the London Polyglot, which was made from the Peshito Syriac; but, as the biblical quotations of the early Christian writers are often loose and inaccurate (because they quote from memory) and the Arabic does not always hold itself strictly to its original, these authorities must be used cautiously.

The Syriac text of "Samuel" was made directly from the Hebrew, and is in the main a literal and correct translation. It is, however, far less useful than the Septuagint for the criticism of the Hebrew text and the elucidation of its meaning:

1) It was probably not made before the 2d century of our Era, at which time the present masoretic text had been substantially formed, and it has in some places perhaps been corrected after the masoretic recension; it is therefore of little use in reaching a pre-masoretic Hebrew text.

2) It sometimes takes liberties with the Hebrew, abridging or expanding, especially in obscure or corrupt passages, as 1 Sam. xiii. 3, 4; xiv. 13, 25, 26; xvi. 15, 16; 2 Sam. v. 6 sq.; xxi. 16; it omits a verse from homœoteleuton, 2 Sam. xiii. 18, or a part of a verse from breviloquence, 2 Sam. vii. 6; it entirely fails to catch a fine conception, as in 1 Sam. xv. 23; it miswrites proper names, as *Ishboshul* 2 Sam. ii. 8, *Kolob* iii. 3, *Adoniram* xx. 24, *Edom* for Aram 2 Sam. x. 6, 8, *prophets* for Abel 2 Sam. xx. 18; and it sometimes misunderstands the meaning and connection of words.

3) It shows some connection with the Septuagint and the Targum, though it is hard to determine the relation between them. It sometimes agrees with the Septuagint against Hebrew and Chaldee, as in 1 Sam. i. 24 (a three-year-old bullock), in the division between chapters iii. and iv., at the end of 2 Sam. iii. 24 and in 2 Sam. xxi. 9.† Very frequently it agrees with the Hebrew against the Septuagint, sometimes varies (commonly slightly) from Hebrew, Septuagint, and Chaldee, and sometimes shows a general agreement with the last, as in 2 Sam. xxiv. 15 and 1 Sam. xvi. 23, where it is with Septuagint and Chaldee against Hebrew. It may be that the translator had the Septuagint before him and occasionally followed it, or that readings from the Greek got from the margin into the text. It is possible also that he followed in some cases the same general Jewish hermeneutical tradition that shows itself in the Targum. For

4) There seem to be in the Syriac a few attempts to avoid anthropomorphisms and unseemly expressions, and a few cases of Rabbinical interpretation. Thus: 2 Sam. xxiv. 16: "the Lord restrained the Angel of death who was slaying the people, and said to him" instead of "Jahveh repented him of the evil and said;" xxiv. 17: "David said to that angel" instead of "David said to Jahveh;" 1 Sam. xxi. 5, 6: "if the young men have kept themselves from the offering (corban). And David said, The offering is lawful for us." In the first clause the Arabic has the full explanation: "if the young men have preserved their vessels from impurity unfit for those that approach the offering." The obscure passage 2 Sam. xxiv. 15, is rendered by the Peshito: "from the morning to the sixth hour" (Hebrew מוֹעֵד), where the Targum has: "from the time of slaying the stated sacrifice to the time of offering it," while the Septuagint, avoiding the halachic interpretation, renders: "from morning to noon" (ἀρίστου).*

In general the masoretic text of "Samuel" is supported by the Peshito Version. The Syriac text has to be closely watched throughout. In addition to Thorndyke's emendations above referred to (found in Vol. VI. of the London Polyglot) see the remarks of Rödiger in his monograph† on the Arabic Version, pp. 76, 77. The Arabic must all along be compared with the Syriac.

The *Arabic Version*. As is remarked above the Arabic Version of "Samuel" in the Polyglots is a translation from the Peshito Syriac, and is useful in the criticism of the text of the latter, not of the Hebrew immediately. It deserves a more careful textual examination than it has yet received. Its character is most fully discussed by Rödiger in the work cited above. The same text (unpointed) with a few variations is given in the Arabic Bible printed for the British and Foreign Bible Society by Sarah Hodgson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1811.

IV. The Jewish-Aramaic (Chaldee) Version.—The text of this version (in the Targum of Jonathan) is given in the London Polyglot and in the edition of P. De Lagarde, Leipzig, 1873.

* Tregelles, Art. *Versions* in Smith's *Bible-Dictionary*. Bleek (*Introd. to Old Test.*, Eng. Trans., II. 447, Note) seems to have supposed that this was a Hexaplar-Syriac text. I have not access to the catalogues of Syriac MSS. in the Bodleian Library and the British Museum by Payne Smith and W. Wright, and do not know whether other MSS. of "Samuel" are found among them.

† Nöldeke (*Zeitschrift d. Deutsch. morgenländ. Gesellschaft*, XXV. 267) remarks that the text of the ancient Syriac Pentateuch MS. in the British Museum sometimes agrees with the Hebrew where our editions approach the Greek more nearly, and that it doubtless preserves the original Syriac more faithfully. The relation between the Septuagint, Syriac and Chaldee calls for closer investigation.

* Perles (*Meletemata Peschitthoniana*, pp. 16–21) adduces other examples, not always in point; comp. Prager, *De Vet. Test. Vers. Syr. quam Peschittho vocant Quæst. Criticæ*, Pars I.

† *De origine et indole Arab. Libr. V. T. Histor. Interpretationis.* Halle, 1829.

This Targum probably received its present form not earlier than the fourth century of our Era (though it doubtless rests on an earlier translation), and is of little use in the establishment of a pre-masoretic text. It is made immediately from the Hebrew, and is in the main a good translation.

It is commonly marked by extreme literalness, but sometimes departs from its text to avoid an anthropomorphic or unseemly expression, to introduce a late legal idea, or to expand and illustrate. The principal *additions* are in 1 Sam. ii. 1–10 and 2 Sam. xxiii. 3, 4, 7, 8, where it inserts rambling commentaries, and in 1 Sam. xv. 17, where it explains Saul's elevation by a historical reference on which the Bible is silent (Benjamin's heading the march through the sea). Goliath's braggart speech in 1 Sam. xvii. 8, given in the London Polyglot, is omitted by Lagarde. It ingeniously fills out the corrupt passage, 1 Sam. xiii. 1, and attempts some explanation of the numbers in 1 Sam. vi. 19. Among its *Rabbinical* features are the substitution of *scribe* for *prophet* in 1 Sam. x. 10, 11, 12; xix. 20, 24; xxviii. 6, and the phrase "remember what is written in the book of the law of Jahveh," 2 Sam. xiii. 11; xx. 18. In 1 Sam. xxviii. 13 it avoids the possible irreverence in *Elohim* by rendering: "angel of Elohim." Its rendering in 1 Sam. xiv. 19 "bring the ephod" instead of the Hebrew "withdraw thy hand," suggests an emendation of the Heb. of verse 18 (see the Textual Notes). Thus, without being of high text-critical authority, it secures a general control over the Hebrew text.

C. H. T.

THE END.

DATE ISSUED	DATE DUE	DATE ISSUED	DATE DUE
[redacted]	[redacted]		